E. C. C. I. Appeal to World Toilers
United Front Proposals in U. S. A.
Madyar on the Question of Fascism

WORKERS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

No. 21

NOVEMBER 5, 1934

Price 10¢

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

ORGAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

Published twice a month in English, Russian, German, French, Chinese and Spanish.

VOL. XI | NOVEMBER 5, 1934 | No. 21

CONTENTS

Page

THREE LESSONS OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT 703
By Bela Kun

APPEAL OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL ON THE SEVENTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION 709

THE WORK OF THE C.P.G.B. SINCE THE SIXTH CONGRESS OF THE C. I. 712
By Harry Pollitt

THE HISTORIC PATH OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL . . . 722
By M. Zorky

Discussion for the Seventh Congress of the C. I.

THE QUESTION OF FASCISM 731
By L. Madyar

THE PROPOSAL OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY FOR UNITED FRONT WITH THE SOCIALIST PARTY IN THE U.S.A. 740
By Sam Brown

THE LATEST MANEUVERS OF THE FRENCH TROTZKYITES 743
By A. Boreau

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT AND STARVATION 746
A Review by J. Davis

Workers Library Publishers, P. O. Box 148, Sta. D, New York City
Subscription price: one year, $2; six months, $1.

THREE LESSONS OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL PROLETARIAT

(In connection with the Seventeenth Anniversary of the October Revolution.)

By BELA KUN

SEVENTEEN years have passed since the time when there took place the mightiest turning point in world history, when, as a result of the victorious October uprising, the working class of a whole country for the first time overthrew capitalism once and for all and established the dictatorship of the proletariat in the form of Soviets. For seventeen years now the working class is the ruling class in the U.S.S.R. For seventeen years now the working class is not only the master of its fate in its own country, but is also one of the decisive factors determining the fate of the working class throughout the whole world. The October Revolution, as the Commune, did not promise any miracles, but has created one.

From the gigantic heights of the socialism which has been won, on the threshold to a well-to-do life for all the toilers, on the eve of classless society, the working class of the Soviet Union, conscious of its unconquerable power and powerfully overcoming all obstacles, directs its glance of proud joy towards the past, towards the time when it was liberated, to the victory won seventeen years ago.

Yes, the Bolsheviks have really been able to maintain power! And not only have they maintained it, but they have firmly constructed the first State in the world wherein emancipated labor lies at the foundation of everything. The weapons of power of this new State serve simultaneously the cause of peace between the peoples who are being threatened by new imperialist wars, and serve the cause of the liberation of the toilers oppressed and exploited by the bourgeoisie in the democratic countries, and threatened and impoverished by fascism, from all oppression and exploitation whatsoever.

* * *

The seventeenth year following the victory of October has been a year of new victories of world historic importance. In this seventeenth year the Soviet Union has achieved great successes in the struggle for peace and has consolidated its international position. The U.S.S.R. was recognized by the most powerful capitalist State, the U.S.A. The entry into the League of Nations of the U.S.S.R. has been estimated even by many of its enemies as a tremendous act on the part of the country of socialism in the struggle for peace.

The year 1934 has been a year of the unheard-of development of heavy industry in the Soviet Union. For the first eight months of the year 1934 heavy industry increased the total of its production by comparison with last year by 28.4 per cent. The branches of industry which previously lagged behind, such as black metallurgy, and the fuel industry, are this year in the forefront of all the remaining branches of national economy. The year 1934 is also to be distinguished by qualitative advances throughout the national economy. It will be sufficient to mention that for the first eight months of this year the productivity of labor increased by 11.8 per cent, while the cost of production was reduced by 5 per cent.

The Seventeenth Anniversary of the October Revolution is at the same time the fifth anniversary of mass collectivization in the village.

The fact that more than 224,000 collective farms unite more than 15 million households, comprising 65 per cent of the total number of peasant households, and the fact of the liquidation of the kulaks as a class, represent a mighty and difficult revolution in the lives and consciousness of tens of millions of yesterday's petty owners, represent a decisive point in the struggle to overcome finally the most persistent relic of capitalism, namely, "the force of habit".

This revolution has become possible only under the conditions of Soviet Power, and on the basis of the fundamental reconstruction of national economy, including agriculture, on the basis of socialist *industrialization.*

The year 1934 has been a year of further victories for the collective farm system.

The advantages of the collective farm system made it possible to overcome the threat of drought which hung over the land of the Soviets in the spring of this year, and for a harvest to be gathered this year over the whole of the U.S.S.R. not worse than the one gathered a year ago, while in many districts the level attained by the record harvest of the year 1933 has been passed. The shock workers operating in the fields are consolidating the new collective farm system organizationally, and on business lines. The contrast between town and country is being destroyed by the forces of the working class and of the collective farm peasantry. The successes achieved in the sphere of industry and agriculture have made it definitely possible to develop a wide program of activity for the raising of the material and cultural

standard of living of the broad masses (the well-being of these masses is to be raised by three times in the course of the Second Five-Year Plan).

We are now coming to the end of but the second year of the Second Five-Year Plan, but the country is completely involved in the realization of this tremendous program. Even from the outside one's eye is caught by the mighty development in those branches of industry which are faced with the task of further improving the material well-being of the broad masses, and also by the successes in the sphere of Soviet trade and of the whole organization of supplies. The supply of the masses with articles of consumption and in general with all the necessities of broad consumption is improving from day to day. Housing construction and the reconstruction of the old towns and the construction of new ones continue to be carried on at an ever more rapid pace.

The following facts give an indication of the scope of the cultural revolution: the almost complete abolition of illiteracy, the more than twenty-six million students in schools of all grades (of whom almost half a million are in the highest grade schools), the more than five million children in pre-school institutions, the huge growth of special high grade colleges, scientific research institutions, clubs and theatres, and the more than thirty-six million circulation of the daily press.

The All-Union Congress of Writers which took place in September has drawn the attention of the representatives of the intellectuals in all lands, and has become transformed into a demonstration of the huge cultural conquests made by the land of the Soviets.

What strikes one especially sharply is the change that has taken place in the face of the Soviet village, which, as a result of collectivization, has passed out of its old poor and half savage condition on to the highroad of well-being and a cultured life. Tractors, combines, automobiles, radio, kino and the thick network of schools (and not only elementary schools but also secondary and special schools) demand tens and hundreds of thousands of not only literate people but also of technically qualified and fully cultured active workers in the new village. The village has already acquired its innumerable intelligentsia. The village is catching up to the socialist town. The gulf between town and village is gradually being reduced, and the contrast between them is being outlived.

Both the town and the village, socialist industry and socialist agriculture, have become mighty smithies forging *the new man*. The complete destruction of exploitation and oppression, creative enthusiasm in the struggle for mighty aims, and the socialist organization of production and labor, are re-educating the millions of builders of classless socialist society.

Not only do the workers of all lands turn their glances full of pride towards the wonderful homeland of the October Revolution. Not only are the proletarians of all capitalist countries attracted by this country where the working class has been victorious, where the dictatorship of the proletariat, the overthrow of capitalism and the construction of socialism have resulted in the abolition of such age-long features inherent in the life of the proletarian as the separation of labor power from the means of production, and uncertainty about the morrow based on the fear of the toiling people in the face of the armed oppressor. Not only do those who see their cherished dreams being brought into life in the mighty construction taking place in the Soviet Union sympathetically follow each step taken by the Soviet fatherland in its victorious struggle to build up a classless socialist society. Even the most far-sighted people in the enemy camp who understand that under capitalism everything cannot continue in the old way, but who do not want socialism, are also directing their searching glances at the growth of the proletarian State in the attempt to find the answer to the question: "What can we learn from the experience of this country, what has given this surprising country the power and the possibility, in the very midst of the destructive crisis that holds the economy and culture of all capitalist countries, to go impetuously forward and upward with gigantic and firm steps?" And these defenders of the capitalist order are putting the question in their own way as to how to utilize the lessons attained, in the interests of capital.

The world historic successes achieved by the U.S.S.R. supply the rising class, the proletariat in the capitalist countries, with new revolutionary energy to create, after the fashion of the Bolsheviks, the preconditions for their own advance, to bring about an October victory in their own country. The dying class, doomed to death by the iron law of history, namely the bourgeoisie and its ideologists, stretch their miserable phantasy to the extreme, and develop reactionary utopias as to how to save the capitalist system and the bourgeois order from the world October by transplanting the Soviet system of planned economy on to capitalist ground. The construction of socialism in the U.S.S.R. spreads colossal waves of revolutionary energy into the camp of the international proletariat, and shatters to bits the miserably reactionary utopian hopes fostered about achieving under capitalism what only socialism can bring about.

In the fire of the October Socialist Revolution, the Bolsheviks, under Lenin's leadership stood at the head of the majority of the working class which rallied behind it the majority of the whole toiling people, and won the dictatorship of the proletariat,

and established *Soviet Power*. And this new link in the new epoch of world history, the epoch of the transformation of capitalist society into socialist society, has been forged in the fire of new class battles by the Bolsheviks, under the leadership of Stalin, who have stood at the head of all the toilers in the mighty land of the proletariat.

The events throughout the world on the eve of the Seventeenth Anniversary of the mighty October, the clash of two fronts, of the two basic classes of bourgeois society, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, the desperate struggle for and against the preservation of capitalist exploitation and imperialist oppression, the battle between exploiters and exploited, between oppressors and oppressed—all this revolves around the problems which the October Revolution has either solved, or predetermined by creating the necessary preconditions for their solution. In this struggle, where fascism and bourgeois democracy, despite all their differences, fight for the preservation of the old order of wage-slavery, while Communism fights for the new classless socialist society, three questions are now especially insistently coming to the forefront in the consciousness of the wide masses of non-Party and social-democratic workers, questions which can only be answered in the light of the October Revolution, and on the lines taken by the October socialist revolution.

It is around these three questions which are being brought forward by the offensive of fascism on the working class and the establishment of fascist dictatorship, that the struggle is going on in a number of countries between the old and the new society, namely: the first question, *about freedom* and the dictatorship of the proletariat; the second question, *about force* and the armed uprising, and the third question, *about the unity of action* of the working class.

* * *

The workers in Germany, Italy, Austria, Japan, Poland and other countries where the rabid bourgeoisie has transformed the State into *one* huge prison for *all* the toilers, are thirsting for freedom. And the workers in the countries of so-called bourgeois democracy are also thirsting for freedom—countries where the bourgeoisie, taking the road to fascism, are step by step depriving the workers of the last remnants of democratic rights.

But the question of freedom is linked up with the question of power. In February of this year the workers of Austria rose in arms in defense of the last relics of their rights and freedom, against the onslaught of fascism. But they only set themselves the problem of defending their freedom, they did not set themselves the question of power, of the dictatorship of the proletariat, and they were defeated. Supreme heroism has been displayed by the Spanish proletariat, in armed struggles, where they have not spared their lives in defense of the rights and freedom won by the overthrow of the military-fascist dictatorship, but cut down by the radical-socialist government and destroyed by monarchist-fascist reaction. The Spanish workers have learned from the experience of the February battles in Austria, and raised the struggle against fascism on to a much higher level than that achieved by their Austrian class brothers. They not only defended their freedom but organized an armed uprising, while the workers of Asturias have fought for Soviet Power under the leadership of the Communists. But the Spanish peasants who when the monarchy was overthrown obtained but few liberties and whom the bourgeois-socialist government did not give the land —these peasants whom the Communists have not yet mobilized in rallying round the proletariat and leading to the seizure of the land, turned away from the Republic and did not support the proletariat. This is why the proletariat of Spain have also not been able to achieve victory at this stage.

The workers of the Soviet Union in times gone by also fought for freedom for tens of years. When they overthrew tsarism, they achieved, as a result of the February revolution, the maximum of freedom attained by the working class within the bounds of the bourgeois system anywhere and at any time. But it soon became clear to the majority of the working class that freedom for the working class is incompatible with freedom for the bourgeoisie. The democratic freedom won by the proletariat in Russia in the February days rendered it exceptionally easy for them to solve (under the leadership of the Bolsheviks) the task of independently organizing and winning the leading role in the revolutionary movement of the peasants. But not more. Before the October Revolution in the freest bourgeois country of that time, in bourgeois-revolutionary Russia, it became manifest that, as Marx says, "the highest social understanding of bourgeois order" is not freedom for all, but that which guarantees the maintenance of the bourgeois capitalist system. And, led by the Bolshevik Party, the proletariat understood that if it was to save itself from the oncoming catastrophe it must seize power.

This has also been confirmed by the fate of Weimar democracy in Germany, and of the "almost socialist democracy" that existed in Austria. This has also been confirmed by the fate of bourgeois democracy in such lands of old democracy as France, by the effort of the most reactionary sections of the bourgeoisie to pass over from the inadequate methods of bourgeois democracy to those which from their point of view are more suitable ones, namely, fascist methods, so as to ward off the overthrow of the capitalist system.

Bourgeois democratic liberties are tolerated only within the bounds of what serves to preserve the capitalist order. The civil liberties of the working class inevitably have been and are being wiped away when the question at stake is that of ensuring the interests of the bourgeoisie.

The hymns of praise sung by the leaders of social-democracy and its most famous theoreticians and politicians, Otto Bauer, Vandervelde, Leon Blum, in honor of bourgeois liberty as liberty for all; the lying speeches of a certain Karl Kautsky regarding the freedom of the working class, about democracy in general under capitalism, the illusions developed by all these in the ranks of the working class have only led to the working class being unable to utilize the liberties won under the bourgeois-democratic system. All this blathering has only led to the loss of rights and liberties already won by the proletariat which the bourgeoisie annulled as soon as the interests of the bourgeoisie so required.

The loss by the proletariat of the liberties attained by it under the bourgeois order is inevitable if, when defending its rights, the proletariat, while appreciating the incompatibility of freedom for the working class and freedom for the bourgeoisie, does not set itself such aims as the overthrow of the bourgeois system, the destruction of the bourgeois class and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat which guarantees freedom only to the proletariat and not to the bourgeoisie.

Only the dictatorship of the proletariat, brought into being as a result of the October victory, has established real proletarian soviet democracy for the toilers, about the scope of which we can get a picture, true, only a weak one, if only from the following two sets of figures: in the elections to the Constituent Assembly in November 1917, 36,262,566 voters voted on the basis of the general electoral law. In 1934, on the other hand, at the forthcoming elections to the Soviets, the number of voters, about which even the social-democratic press writes, has reached ninety millions, and this is so although the former exploiting classes have been deprived of the right to vote. This is what is happening in the land where the proletariat, led by the Leninist Bolshevik Party, has established its open unlimited power, namely, its dictatorship, and through the medium of this revolutionary dictatorship has established the pre-conditions for the establishment of such a system where not "the unfree thing, but the free human being, is dominant".

* * *

Fascism is on the offensive in a number of countries. The workers, Communists, social-democrats, toilers of all kinds in Austria and in Spain, entered the struggle this year with arms in their hands against the concentrated military forces of the fascist bourgeoisie. Terrified philistines like Hilferding have issued abominably lying pamphlets against the heroic proletariat of Austria, and have sneered at the Austrian workers for being unable to determine correctly "the bounds of force". The English philistine, Wells, put the question to Comrade Stalin, the leader of the world proletariat, about the advisability of the proletariat applying force. Otto Bauer would like to convince the proletarians that "the social-democrat values the word 'freedom' more than the Communist does, while the Communist places the historic role of force higher than does the social-democrat".

The efforts which have ended in failure of the Austrian and Spanish proletarians to maintain their liberty by force show not the limited role played by force. On the contrary, they show that only those may arrive at victory who are in a position to understand correctly the historic role of the force of armed uprising, not as an accidental episode in the struggle, but as a necessary pre-condition for victory, a pre-condition which must be carefully and thoroughly prepared beforehand both politically and from a military technical point of view. They show that the only path to lead to victory is the path of October.

The proletariat has never been able hitherto to convince itself with such clarity about the correctness of the old saying to the effect that "he who has arms has freedom", as now, when a turning point in world history has been arrived at, when the historic struggle between capitalism and socialism has developed into the duel between fascism and Communism, and when bourgeois democracy is also becoming ever more penetrated by the elements of fascism. The following most important lesson has arisen from the experience of the armed struggles of the proletariat this past year, when contrasted with the October uprising, namely, that of the necessity of applying violence and of the need for all-round preparations for the violent overthrow of the bourgeoisie. Let the proletariat not let itself be deceived again. The working class have no need for empty blather about the application of violence. They must make really correct and appropriate preparations for the armed uprising, if they wish to ensure a successful way out for their struggle against fascism. In the same measure as the ideological struggle against fascism is necessary, and as it is important to bring conviction to bear on the proletarian and semi-proletarian elements who still continue to help the bourgeoisie to save capitalism, in the same degree is it of no avail to make efforts to convince the reactionary bourgeoisie to fence off its capitalist private property by means which already are not achieving their aim, to give up fascism.

The history of the working class does not know of any greater betrayal of the interests of the working class than the theories that are now, after the Aus-

trian and Spanish events, once again being cooked up by the leaders of social-democracy, especially by the so-called Anglo-Saxon socialists, and also by the scared German philistines from the camp of social-democracy in emigration. The essence of these theories may be reduced to the following: "Force was a method of the bourgeois revolution, a means to effect the transfer from feudalism to capitalism. But the transfer from capitalism to socialism can only be brought about in peaceful fashion, only as the result of the numerical preponderance and organized character of the proletariat."

The numerical preponderance of the proletariat has long existed. Its organized character, as such, reached a high level in Austria, Germany, and even in Spain, well before the decisive passage of fascism to the offensive. The old social order was undermined, shattered by the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat. But it did not and could not collapse of itself, and the bourgeoisie would not allow it to. They mobilized all means of applying violence to save their power. What did the majority of social-democracy counterpose to this, social-democracy which until recent times stood at the head of the majority of the working class in capitalist countries? While undertaking a policy of cooperation with the bourgeoisie and thus clearing the way for fascism, social-democracy either denied violence in words, while in deeds did not hesitate to indulge in any act of police violence against the proletariat (the shooting down of the First of May demonstration in Berlin by Zorgeibel) or else displayed waverings at the decisive moment when the proletariat had to resort to violence, which was equal to treachery. The October uprising of the Russian proletariat in 1917 was crowned with victory because the Party which stood at the head of the majority of the working class considered that the application of violence by the proletariat as against the violence of the bourgeoisie was no accident called forth by the peculiar nature of the historical situation, but was a necessity. It is necessary to prepare the proletariat for the application of violence against the domination of the bourgeoisie in good time, planfully, politically and organizationally, morally and technically.

* * *

The offensive of fascism throughout the capitalist world, the establishment of open fascist dictatorship in a number of countries and the danger of war have given rise among the social-democratic and non-Party workers to a very powerful urge in favor of the united front of struggle together with the Communists. The united front of the Communists and social-democrats in the struggle against fascism and war and against the capitalist offensive is the path to the winning of the majority of the working class to the banner of the consistent class struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat, the banner of Communism.

The October uprising smashed the State machine of the bourgeoisie, broke the backbone of the counter-revolution, because the majority of the proletariat acted in unanimity at the decisive points and not only offered resistance at the decisive moments but moved forward purposefully, organized by the Bolsheviks and led by them. In spite of the fact that, with the exception of Petrograd, Moscow and a number of other big industrial centers in the country, the majority of the deputies' mandates in the Soviets were in the hands of the petty-bourgeois parties, the Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionists, almost up to the very moment of the October Revolution, the Bolsheviks devoted all their energy to the struggle for the Soviets.

They fought steadily for the majority in the Soviets, because they knew that the Soviets were a mighty conquest for the working class, the form of the dictatorship of the proletariat given by history, but nevertheless only the socialist form of the political organization of the proletariat.

"Everything depends on the *contents which will be put into this mold.*

"It is not only a question of the Soviets themselves but mainly of who will direct them." (Stalin.)

The experience of the Soviets in the German revolution in 1918, led by the followers of Scheidemann and the Independents, is the best proof of this Leninist principle.

The Bolsheviks worked in a planned and purposeful manner to bring about through the Soviets the unity of action of the working class and its alliance with the peasants, with the proletariat as the leading force.

On the eve of the October Revolution, in the struggle for the revolutionary unity of action of the working class, the Bolsheviks won over the majority in the Petrograd and Moscow Soviets and in the Soviets of a number of industrial districts. This was a necessary prerequisite for the October victory.

At the same time and on this basis, the Bolsheviks won tremendous influence among the masses of peasants by their policy, their consistent struggle for peace and land, and especially by their adoption of the agrarian program which the peasant congress voted for. At the time of the armed uprising the Bolsheviks made an agreement with the Left Social-Revolutionaries so as to ensure the support of the revolution by the broad masses of the peasants. As a result, the Bolsheviks more and more undermined the influence of the Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionaries in the Soviets of Workers', Peasants and Soldiers' Deputies. On June 3, 1917, at the First Congress of Soviets, the Bolsheviks constituted only 13 per cent of the delegates but at the Second All-Russian Con-

gress of Soviets, when the representatives of the toiling masses sanctioned the armed seizure of power, the Bolsheviks had 51 per cent of the places. At the Third Congress of Soviets, the Bolsheviks had 61 per cent, at the Fourth Congress in March, 1918, this number had already risen to 64 per cent, while at the Fifth Congress in July, 1918, when the agreement with the Social-Revolutionaries was ended, the toilers had sent to the Congress 66 per cent of Bolshevik delegates.

The stubborn struggle of the Bolsheviks for the unity of action of the working class and to secure allies for the proletariat, a struggle which could not be stopped by any temporary defeats, was the prerequisite for the victory of October, for the winning of power and the consolidation of this power.

The social-democrats and the non-Party workers are beginning to realize the basic lesson of the October Revolution, namely, that the establishment of the revolutionary unity of action of the working class under the leadership of the Communist vanguard is the path towards the destruction of the influence of the bourgeoisie over the working class, the path towards the winning by the proletariat of the hegemony over the movement of the middle strata in the town and village, the path towards the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism, the path towards the dictatorship of the proletariat, the path towards victory. Hence the stubborn resistance to the Communist Parties on the part of the Second International and the majority of its parties, in respect to the struggle of the Communists for the unity of action of the working class, and their attempts to replace the slogan of the united front of struggle by the slogan of "organizational unity" in the sense of the fusion of Communism with reformism, in the sense of the absorption of Communism in reformism. The Communist Parties must and will carry on the struggle for the united front still more stubbornly, thus bringing the social-democratic and non-Party workers to the side of Communism, knowing that the proletariat desires to and must create the guarantees which will ensure victory just as the Bolsheviks established the prerequisites for the victory of the October Revolution.

* * *

For more than ten years international social-democracy unanimously excommunicated the October Revolution and all its achievements. But gradually large and small groups began to be formed in the Second International which little by little realized that "the things taking place in the Soviet Union may, perhaps, be really recognized as socialist construction". The theoreticians and political leaders, including those who uttered incitements towards intervention and also those who have at length, after seventeen years of the October Revolution, recognized that the defense of the U.S.S.R. is in the interests of the international proletariat itself, have got on well together and still do so within the limits of the Second International. But the social-democratic workers themselves have utterly rejected social-interventionism. The construction of socialism in the Soviet Union is guarded not only by the conscious revolutionary vanguard of the working class in the capitalist countries, but by the entire revolutionary proletariat. This shows that the day is near when the international proletariat will forge the will to overthrow the domination of the bourgeoisie in the united front of struggle, and march under the leadership of the Comintern to the storming of capitalism under the basic slogan of the conquest of Soviet Power.

FURTHER MATERIALS ON THE "THREE LESSONS OF THE OCTOBER VICTORY"

THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND RENEGADE KAUTSKY
By V. I. LENIN
No. 21 of Little Lenin Library
30 cents

STATE AND REVOLUTION
By V. I. LENIN
No. 14 of Little Lenin Library
30 cents

THE MOST BURNING QUESTION—UNITY OF ACTION
By BELA KUN
10 cents

Order from
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 East 13th Street) New York City

APPEAL OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL ON THE SEVENTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

TO the working men and women of the whole world!
To all toilers of all oppressed nations!

Comrades and class brothers!

Seventeen years have passed since the Russian proletariat, guided by the Communist (Bolshevik) Party under the leadership of Lenin, overthrew the rule of capital, the bourgeoisie, and the landlords, and placed power in its own hands.

The Socialist October Revolution, which unlocked a new era in the development of humanity, succeeded through the armed uprising of the Russian workers with the support of millions of peasants. Through many heroic years of struggle they had been preparing against the ruling classes under the guidance of the Bolsheviks. This preparation was in the winning over of a majority of the working class through the irreconcilable struggle against the compromising reformist parties of the Mensheviks and the Social-Revolutionaries, and in decisive battles against oppressive hunger and imperialist war, in battles for the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat for Socialism.

The power of the working class in league with the peasantry, the power of the Soviets—the councils of workers, peasants and Red Army soldiers—was a harsh dictatorship against the profiteering classes. Along with Soviet power these developed the broadest working class democracy among the masses. This power of the organized masses was the force behind the fight against the furious resistance of the exploiters, against imperialist intervention. This was the thing which assured the proletariat of victory during the civil war. This was the strength which accomplished the industrialization of the land of the Soviets. This spread collectivization to the smallest hamlet. With the leadership of the Communist Party the dictatorship of the proletariat made certain the success of the First Five-Year Plan. Now the Party is leading toward the victory of the Second Five-Year Plan, which is laying the foundations of Socialist economy through the liquidation of classes.

The Soviet Union, the land of victorious proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship, presents the whole world with a clear picture of what the working class in a technically and culturally backward country may bring about when it takes power in its own hands.

In capitalist countries the rule of the bourgeoisie carries with it heavy economic crisis and greater ruin than the four years of the last imperialist war. Even the most advanced capitalist countries have been thrown backward many years. The slight increase in production in the last two years has in no way bettered the conditions of the toilers; inescapable unemployment reigns everywhere, millions of peasants and farmers are still being ruined, millions are entering on manhood without bread, without hope, with no better prospects than to roam the streets. The need and misery of the toilers deepens ever more intensely.

With the guidance of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union the dictatorship of the proletariat has founded the basis for the steady increase of the well-being and culture of the toiling masses. It has transformed the Soviet Union into a land where unemployment does not and cannot exist, where the wages of workers and employees climb in an unbroken line, where an all-embracing system of social insurance has been created, where for every worker the next day brings certainty, where labor itself has been set on a pedestal of honor. The Socialist reorganization of agriculture has put an end to barren flat land and has assured the entire collectivized peasantry an increased standard of living and culture. Soviet power has freed previously oppressed national minorities and united them in close fraternal bonds.

The workers and collectivized peasants of the Soviet Union offer a brilliant example of a progressive devotion to the cause of Socialism, an example of true international solidarity with the oppressed and exploited of the whole world.

Already the working and peasant masses of China are following the fighting example of the Soviet Union and have set up Soviet power in a portion of their territory. The entire Chinese nation knows about the Chinese Soviets, which for the colonial masses are a banner on which is inscribed the only road of salvation from the slavery of imperialism and the yoke of their own exploiters.

The exploited and oppressed of the entire world protect the Soviet Union as a fortress of victorious Socialism, as a bulwark of peace, as the mighty smith hammering out the basis of a new Socialist culture, as the protector of the proletarian world revolution, the Socialist fatherland of all workers of all countries, of all oppressed peoples of the world, the gleaming unquenchable lighthouse which comforts and

beckons all humanity in its struggle against capitalist slavery.

Over the toilers of all countries is concentrated all the dangers of a new imperialist war. The capitalist world is arming itself feverishly, is conjuring into the world ever new and hitherto unknown devilish instruments of mass destruction. War, however, can be swept away only through the gathering of all the forces of the proletariat in a united front for the battle against capitalism. A new devastating bloodbath for the workers can be prevented only through a complete break of the workers with the compromising reform politics of the social-democracy, only through a victorious fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In order to find some way out of its crisis the capitalist world bourgeoisie seizes on ever slimmer margins of territory for the plunder of the workers, farmers and peasantry; these are the economically weak countries. The bourgeoisie is attempting to destroy the first troops of the working class. It is robbing the last few remnants of their democratic rights, stealing more profit from their wretched wages and worsening their conditions, endeavoring to annihilate their revolutionary vanguard. Fascism, seizing power in Germany and Austria, seizing power in Italy and Poland, is a threat to the toilers of all countries. As the storm-troop of the bourgeoisie against the working class, fascism is seeking as its first line of offense to organize itself against the advance brigade of the world proletariat, the Soviet Union.

But the working class and the toiling masses will be in a position to thrust aside this advance stab of fascism when the proletariat of a fighting united front masses its ranks and when, together with all toilers, it engages in the decisive struggle against capitalism.

The politics of compromise, which the leaderships of the Socialist Parties conducted, particularly in the years 1918-1920, frustrated the proletarian revolution in Germany, Austria, Hungary and Italy. Social-democratic politics were the means by which the bourgeoisie tied the hands of the working class, split its ranks and weakened its forces in the face of the attack of the class enemy. The politics of compromising with the bourgeoisie has led Germany as well as Austria to fascism.

There is no peaceful road to power for the proletariat.

There is no peaceful road to Socialism.

True to its historical mission—the preparation of the masses for the seizure of State power by the proletariat—the Communist International calls with greater impressiveness on every worker to place himself in the ranks of the united front, for the organizing of united action against fascism and war preparations; it calls on the workers of all countries to unite under the tried red banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, under the banner of the Comintern, for the overthrow of the power of the bourgeoisie.

The idea of storming capitalism stirs more strongly in the consciousness of the masses. The social-democratic workers are breaking with reform and compromise, the tools of the bourgeoisie, and are passing over to the road of the class struggle. In February of this year the heroic workers of Austria lumped together the reform politics of the social-democracy with the bourgeoisie and fought against both, weapons in hand, in order to stave off fascism. Nevertheless they suffered defeat, because the social-democracy which had led them and armed them politically, had not prepared them for decisive struggle, had not led them in the attack on capitalism.

The working class of France showed their first and immediate opposition to fascism by the general strike in the February days. But their fight against approaching fascism would have been so much more successful, more powerful, had the proletariat been rid of its democratic illusions and swiftly massed under the banner of Communism.

In October the toilers of Spain arose and by force of arms protected their bread and freedom by beating back the attack of fascist reaction. In Asturias the workers fought for the power of workers and peasants under the leadership of the Communist Party.

More and more frequently the organized workers of the social-democracy are breaking with the socialist and bourgeois organization, more and more frequently take up with the Communists the fight against fascism, capitalism and war.

Brother proletarians!

The Communist International turned to the Socialist and Labor International with the appeal and proposal that in all countries united action be undertaken by the Communist and Socialist Parties for the organizing of support for the battling Spanish people. Yet at the moment when the artillery of the ruling class shot apart the pits in Asturias where the miners had buried themselves alive for protection, at the very moment when the airplane squadrons were bombing the cities and towns of Spain, when every day, every hour thousands of heroic workers and peasants of Spain, their wives and children, were sacrificing their lives, at this moment the official leaders of the Socialist and Labor International, hiding under formalities of "the gravity of the question", postponed their decision on united action for three weeks!

The Communist International hereby sets forth its policies of the united front.

Proletarians of all countries, demonstrate your

solidarity with the fight of the Spanish masses! Step forward as one man against the Spanish bourgeoisie, which has called on all its forces in order to crush the working class and peasantry in blood!

The Spanish workers, who have taken up the battle against capitalism, are the sons of our class. The workers of Asturias, who have raised the banner of struggle for power by the workers and peasants, are our brothers. Their cause is the cause of the entire world proletariat.

Class brothers and comrades!

Exert every ounce of strength for the united front of the working class against fascism and imperialist war, for the fight for bread and freedom, for the hastening of the struggle for Socialism!

Social-democratic workers! Workers of all political opinions! Unite under the banner of the Communist International. Advance on the revolutionary road by which the Russian proletariat won its October Revolution, the only road of victory for the working class. All out for the fight against fascism and war! All out for the protection of the heroic Spanish workers and peasants! Defend the Soviet Union—the Socialist fatherland of all toilers and oppressed, the bulwark of Socialism and international peace! Support the Chinese Soviets! Long live the united front of the working class! Long live the league of struggle of workers and peasants of the mother-countries and the colonies! Long live the proletarian world revolution! Long live the dictatorship of the proletariat of the whole world! Long live Socialism!

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL.

MATERIALS ON THE PROGRAM, STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF THE COMINTERN

PROGRAM OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL
Together with Constitution and Statutes
10 cents

•

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALIST WAR AND THE TASKS OF THE COMMUNISTS
Resolution of the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International
5 cents

•

FIGHTING FASCISM IN THE FACTORIES
How the Young Communist League of Germany Fights in the Factories to Overthrow the Fascist Dictatorship.
5 cents

•

THE FEBRUARY STRUGGLE IN AUSTRIA AND ITS LESSONS
By BELA KUN
5 cents

•

SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY—STEPPING STONE TO FASCISM
or Otto Bauer's Latest Discovery
By D. Z. MANUILSKY
5 cents

•

Order from
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 East 13th Street) New York City

THE WORK OF THE C. P. G. B. SINCE THE SIXTH CONGRESS OF THE C. I.

By HARRY POLLITT

THE period in Britain since the Sixth World Congress of the Communist International, held in the autumn of 1928, has been one of the most important in the history of British politics. Many fundamental and far-reaching changes have taken place in the policy of the British ruling class in this period; changes brought about by the economic and political developments, strikingly foretold in the analysis of the international situation made by the Sixth Congress.

As was common to other capitalist countries in 1928, the capitalists and reformist leaders in Britain were confident that a new era of ever expanding capitalist prosperity was at hand. The improvement in the trade position of Britain, largely brought about by the betrayal of the General Strike in 1926 by the reformist leaders, the subsequent defeat of the miners, had been followed by heavy attacks on the workers' standards, intensive application of rationalization, and on this basis there had been a certain revival of production. But it was a revival brought about by a lowering of the workers' standards, and the most intense forms of exploitation in the factories.

These facts, of course, were not considered relevant to the "new perspectives for organized capitalism" being dangled before the eyes of the British workers.

Labor leaders paid visits to America and came back drugged with Fordism. "Ford was superseding Marx", we were told by the theorists of the Labor Movement.

The I.L.P. was busy with its glowing promises of "Socialism through capitalist prosperity", to quote the words of its theoretician, Brailsford, at that time. "Socialism through the adoption of the Living Wage Policy", was the slogan of the I.L.P.

The Labor Party was busy preparing for future General Elections and compiling its program, "Labor and the Nation", which was to give every section of the community a square deal, and injure the interests of none.

The capitalists were busy proclaiming the need for more permanent and closer collaboration with Labor. There was to be compensation for those displaced by rationalization, the workers were to have more recognition in the factories, and a real place in the Sun of Capitalist Industry.

This was Britain in the autumn of 1928. No thought or belief in any coming economic crisis, ever onwards to more and better forms of organized capitalism. Like their counterparts on the Continent, the British labor leaders were tireless in their talk of "the new situation" and "the need for a new and more statesmanlike approach to the problems that modern capitalism has brought forward".

Recalling these facts, it is important to note again the perspective given by the Sixth Congress in the autumn of 1928, and we shall see at once the correctness of the Communist International's analysis, how totally wrong the reformists were, and the bitter price the workers under their influence have paid.

The thesis of the Sixth Congress stated:

> "Therefore, the development of the contradictions of capitalist stabilization inevitably leads, in the final analysis, to the present 'stabilization' period growing into a period of gigantic cataclysms."

It is worth while drawing the attention of the reformist workers time and time again to the above quotation, because they know only too well how deadly true the "period of gigantic cataclysms" has turned out to be. Germany, Austria, Spain are very pertinent to point out just now. In America, the classic land of Fordism and the New Deal, we have had and are still witnessing some of the greatest conflicts between labor and capital that have ever been known in America. It will greatly enhance the authority of future Congresses of the Communist International if we recall these quotations.

In regard to fascism, the Sixth Congress Theses stated the following:

> "Fascist tendencies and the rudiments of the fascist movement exist in a more or less developed form in nearly all countries. The ideology of class cooperation—the official ideology of social-democracy—has many points of contact with fascism. The employment of fascist methods in the struggle against the revolutionary movement is observed in a rudimentary form in the practice of numerous social-democratic parties, as well as in that of the reformist trade union bureaucracy."

At the same time as the Sixth Congress of the Communist International was making its analysis, the British Trade Union Congress was meeting. The main issue before this Congress was that popularly known as Mondism. The General Council of the Trade Union Congress submitted a Report, which

was accepted by the Congress, in which were analyzed what should be the future methods of policy for the trade union movement of Britain. It was stated there were three courses open for adoption. Firstly, the path of revolutionary struggle, which was "decisively rejected as futile, certain to fail, and sure to lead to bloodshed and misery". (Shades of Germany and Austria!)

Secondly, for the unions to stand aside from present developments and tell the "employers to get on with their own job", while the unions would pursue the policy of fighting sectionally for improvements. This course was also described "as futile".

Finally, there was a third course, and this was the course adopted at the Swansea Trade Union Congress, in 1928:

> "The third course is for the trade union movement to say boldly that not only is it concerned with the prosperity of industry, but that it is going to have a voice as to the way industry is carried on, so that it can influence the new developments that are taking place. The ultimate policy of the movement can find more use for an efficient industry than for a derelict one, and the unions can use their power to promote and guide the scientific reorganization of industry as well as to obtain material advantages from that reorganization".

Therefore we can see how in 1928 the whole policy of the Trade Union Congress, Labor Party, and I.L.P., was based upon an entirely false perspective, *i.e.*, there are no further crises of capitalism, but there is organized capitalism leading to socialism, on the basis of class collaboration. But at the same time as this was taking place a fierce drive was also commencing against the revolutionary workers both in the trade unions and in the Labor Party, in order to try to remove all obstacles that aimed to prevent this policy being operated.

In May, 1929, came a general election, and the return of a second Labor Government. Reformist illusions at this time were very strong, and amongst the masses strong beliefs existed that now a real new era was going to open. The first shock was not long in coming. In July, 1929, there was a big cotton strike in Lancashire, and, through the medium of Labor Government intervention and arbitration, heavy wage-cuts were inflicted upon the cotton workers.

This gave the clue to all that followed during the existence of the second Labor Government. What happened to the Lancashire cotton workers, happened in the same way to the Yorkshire woolen workers, and South Wales miners. The Anomalies Act of the Labor Government was the father and mother of the Means Test. Its repression of the colonial peoples has not been improved upon, even by the present National government.

When the economic crisis in the winter of 1929-30 drove Britain into its vortex, the Labor Government excelled itself in its efforts to assist the capitalists to solve the crisis at the expense of the workers, *i.e.*, the May Economy Commission, Special Cabinet Economy Commissions. At this time there was also a rising militancy amongst the workers, big strikes were taking place, there was a rapid growth in the disillusionment of the workers with the Labor Government, revealed in the loss of votes at every by-election which took place.

With the deepening of the crisis, unemployment figures steadily rising, the competition for the dwindling market becoming fiercer and fiercer; the ruling class, in spite of the Labor Government's willingness to carry through their demands for further attacks on the employed and unemployed workers, decided in view of the whole situation that extraordinary measures were necessary to save British capitalism, and, in August, 1931, they kicked the Labor Government out of power.

A National Government was formed, headed by three principal Labor leaders, MacDonald, Snowden and Thomas. Immediately the fiercest attacks were begun on the whole working class, and at the same time plans were laid for an intensive attack upon Britain's trade rivals.

Britain went off the gold standard. The Englishman's proud boast, "As safe as the Bank of England" was not sounding so proud as formerly. The century-old policy of free trade was abandoned for one of protection. Currency devaluated, and elaborate systems of trade pacts, quotas and tariffs were worked out. The famous Ottawa Agreement was put through, and the most open attacks, hostility and war preparations made against the Soviet Union, so that it soon became possible to describe the National Government as replacing France as the organizer of a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union.

But the attacks on the workers were meeting fierce resistance. The attempt to cut the wages of the navy led to a mutiny in the Atlantic fleet at Invergordon, an event which astounded the world. The attacks on the unemployed led to great class battles in Belfast, Birkenhead, Liverpool and Bristol, and great mass demonstrations were the order of the day throughout Britain.

A general election took place in November, 1931. The ruling class utilized every conceivable weapon of propaganda and lies to stampede the country to return a National Government. As was only natural it was the Labor leader, Snowden, who was chosen to play the leading role in attempting to deceive the workers. His infamous wireless broadcast on the eve of the election, that, unless a National Government was elected, the workers' Post Office

savings would be in danger, will long be remembered in "democratic Britain".

The treachery and betrayal of the Labor Government and the disillusionment it had caused amongst the workers greatly facilitated the return of a National Government.

The offensive against the workers went on unabated —wage cuts, Means Test, unemployment benefit cuts, carried through by orders-in-Council, and Parliament told about it afterwards—but still the figures of unemployment continued to rise. Chamberlain held out no hope for ten years. MacDonald spoke about big sections of the unemployed being superfluous scrap.

The workers continued to fight heroically against the capitalist attacks. The big demonstrations, hunger marches, the big Lancashire cotton strike in the summer of 1932, all show this.

Alongside all this, great ferment was expressing itself inside the ranks of the trade unions and the Labor Party. The reformist leaders were bitterly criticized and forced to all sorts of subterfuges to explain away the record of the Labor Government. It found strongest expression inside the I.L.P., which culminated in July, 1932, by leaving the Labor Party. The minority in the I.L.P. formed the Socialist League in England and the Socialist Party in Scotland, both organizations remaining affiliated to the Labor Party.

The Labor Party leaders were replying to the discontent inside their party with promises: "It would be different next time, let us all work now for a third Labor Government". New programs were worked out, differing in no essentials from the Liberal-Labor platform of 1929. The trade union leaders were pursuing, to the fullest limits, the policy of Mondism. No attempt to organize united resistance or common action. No working out a common lead or strategy. The standing argument of political and trade union leaders was "you cannot fight during an economic crisis, wait till the next general election."

The National Government went ahead with its policy of lowering the workers' standards at home and in the colonial countries; every conceivable measure was resorted to in an endeavor to gain trade advantages, at the same time, in line with other capitalists, it steadily increased its war preparations.

In the last quarter of 1933 a slight improvement could be noted in the trade position of Britain. This improvement continued until June, 1934, but has not been maintained since then. The speeches of National Government ministers, like Runciman, now begin to reveal some anxiety about the future. In his speech in Parliament on July 27, he stated:

> "There are signs that the home market is nearing saturation point. I have already drawn attention to the fact that it cannot expand without unduly endangering our export trade beyond certain limits. . . . We must rely on an improvement in world trade for an improvement in the employment figures. World trade unfortunately is still in the stronghold of restrictions in many regions, and the best that can be said is that there are indications that the tendency of international trade to decline is being restricted, although there are yet no signs of any marked improvement. I do not believe there can be any very great improvement in the trade of the world until we reach somewhat calmer times."

A few days later the Federation of British Industries issued its *Quarterly Analysis of the Economic Situation,* and amongst other things had the following to say:

> "It is, however, becoming increasingly clear that so far from British trade being, as many still believe, at the beginning of a recovery, it is probably already back to normal, having regard to the limitations of the international situation. That situation shows few signs of improvement, and in some directions has deteriorated. Apart from the many outbreaks of social and political unrest, and the exacerbation of trade and exchange restrictions, the condition of certain of the countries still on an operative gold standard is giving cause for anxiety."

In August there was held a special meeting of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain, at which a discussion took place on the situation in Britain and the next tasks of the Party. The resolution of the Plenum of the Central Committee showed how life itself overthrew the hopes and aims of the capitalists to return to "stabilization". It showed how barefaced was their attempt to conceal the real situation behind the boast of "recovery". The resolution further showed that the necessity for the revolutionary socialist solution of the crisis stands out ever more sharply, and it summed up the policy of the National Government as follows:

> "In this situation the policy of the National Government becomes more and more openly based, not on a perspective of stabilization and successful conquest of the economic crisis, but on a perspective of rapidly increasing imperialist antagonisms, and sharpening the class struggle at home.
>
> "In the field of foreign policy, the break with America over the debts, the military conversations with France, for an eventual alliance in war, the support of German re-armament and the encouragement of Japanese aggression in the Far East against the Soviet Union, are now followed by the open advance to the full armaments race,

as shown in increased armaments expenditure, new enlarged naval demands for the Naval Conference next year, and a new air building program for 42 additional squadrons.

"Not only in Britain but in the Empire the National Government war preparations directed against the Soviet Union are going forward, as, for example, the rapid mechanization of the Indian Army, the development of the air bases in Iraq, the survey of the Soviet frontiers, under the guise of scientific expeditions.

"In internal policy, the increasing drive towards preparatory measures of a fascist type against the workers is seen in the Unemployment Act and Police Act already carried, in the Sedition Bill, in the new legislation under preparation for the police control of meetings, in the numerous prosecutions of militants, as well as in the direct assistance and protection given in practice to the open fascist movement of Mosley.

"At the same time, the National Government presses forward its economic policy of tightening of the grip of monopolist capital under direct State leadership in all branches of economy by promoting the formation of State aided cartels and price fixing combines, by subsidies to industry, and by quota systems and artificial price raising in agriculture for the benefit of the landlords and big farmers.

"All these policies are directed to increase the domination and profits of the ruling bourgeoisie at the expense of the workers and petty bourgeoisie. These economic policies are at the same time closely linked with the advance to fascism, and the strategic preparation for war."

This sketch of the main developments that have taken place since the Sixth Congress, can now form the basis of considering the work of the Communist Party during this period, and will perhaps help in the important discussions that are taking place in all sections of the Communist International.

Before the Ninth Plenum of the E.C.C.I. there had been important discussions in the C.P.G.B. on the line of class against class, and the need for openly fighting the Labor Party in elections, and for independent leadership of the economic struggles. There was a division on this issue in the Central Committee of 1928 and at the Ninth Plenum the British question occupied an important place in the discussions.

The issue was fought out and agreement reached on fighting for the new line. But it soon became clear that in some cases it was only agreement on paper, and not in deeds, for in the intervening period before the Sixth Congress, there were many hesitations and mistakes in carrying out the line.

The Sixth Congress, affirming the slogan "class against class", discussed the tasks of the C.P.G.B., and the resolution that was adopted instructed "the Party to initiate a wide discussion on the tactical change in the Party policy and on the methods of carrying out the new tactics".

With this guide, the Party endeavored to popularize the Sixth Congress decisions and discussion, and to apply them concretely to the situation in this country.

Wide discussion took place in the Party, and good sales were secured for the various pamphlets, containing the Congress decisions.

A big campaign was organized against Mondism; conferences, meetings were held all over the country, great support was won for our policy, but the gravest mistake was made in this situation, by the Party actually slackening off work in the trade unions, a mistake which we paid for dearly in subsequent years. The new line was quite wrongly interpreted to mean that there was no longer anything to be gained by working in the reformist unions, and more stress was placed upon the role of the unorganized workers.

The new line was also not concretely applied in every phase of Party activity, especially in our concrete exposure of reformism. The result was that in the general election of 1929 there was a minority of comrades on the Central Committee, who, whilst in favor of putting forward Communist candidates where possible, in other places were for supporting the Labor Party.

This attitude not only affected the electoral policy of the Party but had its political repercussions in every phase of Party activity, considerably retarding the full force and authority of the Party from being mobilized to carry out the decisions of the Sixth Congress.

Nevertheless, the Party was very active amongst the unemployed and took an active part in strikes, especially the cotton strike of 1929, but the outstanding weakness of this work was that we took part in the strikes only after they had broken out and were looked upon in many instances as "outsiders"—a situation undoubtedly due to our bad methods of work in the factories and the criminal neglect of work in the trade unions.

The Party gave full support during this period to the struggle of the revolutionary miners of Scotland, who were fighting against the splitting policy of the reformist miners' leaders. The split which was forced brought about the formation of the United Mine Workers of Scotland Trade Union, which, in spite of terrific obstacles, is playing today a leading part in the life and activity of the Scottish miners.

But taking the work of the Party as a whole in this period, we can say that, in spite of certain achievements, *in the main the Party was deeply sectarian* in its methods (not in the sense of "Left" doctrinairism, but in its ideological-political narrow-

ness) and isolated from the mass movement, and not able to organize the growing mass discontent that was developing in the Trade Unions and Labor Party against the Labor Government and against the results of the Mondist policy of the Trade Union Congress.

In November, 1929, the Eleventh Congress of the Party was held, to which the E.C.C.I. sent a special Open Letter, which naturally became the background to the whole Congress discussion. The Open Letter played a decisive part in the history of our Party, and all of us may profit by reading and studying it again.

We will quote from the Open Letter to refresh our memories as to what was the situation in our Party at that time:

> "Your Congress must mark a turning point in the determined application of the new line, and the radical transformation of the form of organization and methods of work of the Party in order that it may play the leading role in the growing class struggles.
>
> "Your Congress is called upon to make a final and decisive break with the opportunist hesitations and vacillations of the past, to put an end to the present internal situation in the Party which is hampering its activities, and to bring it out on the broad road of becoming a mass organization, the vanguard of the working class in the fight for the overthrow of capitalism.
>
> "The E.C.C.I. is confident that the Congress will approach its tasks in a Leninist manner and enable the Party in the shortest possible time to become a decisive factor in the class struggle.
>
> "The Communist Party of Great Britain must definitely understand that it is useless talking about a mass Bolshevik Party, about the leading role of the Party in the class struggle, unless it has close contact with the masses, unless it closely studies the mass economic and political struggles, unless it actually organizes and leads these struggles, and unless it systematically, day in and day out, exposes the treacherous social-fascist role of the 'Labor' Government and its henchmen.
>
> "The Communist Party must become the focus, the political expression and the organizer of the growing mass protest movement and struggle, against the 'Labor' Government. The Communist Party must become transformed from a merely propagandist organization into the independent leader of the economic and political struggles of the working class."

But there was also another important political question the Open Letter took up. It was the question of a daily paper. For years the C.I. had insisted upon a daily paper in Britain, but the difficulties had always been exaggerated, and few concrete steps taken to make a Communist daily a possibility.

The Leeds Congress elected a new Central Committee, and an immediate improvement in the work of the Party became evident. The whole Party was now firmly united on the line of the C.I. On the first of January, 1930, we launched the *Daily Worker*. The *Daily* has played a tremendous role in every working class struggle since that time. Its continued existence has been described as "a working class miracle". It has gathered to its support thousands of workers who consistently support the paper, by the heaviest financial sacrifices. In the four years of its existence it has been subject to continual attacks by the Government, employers, and Labor leaders. But it lives, it plays its part and in spite of its shortcomings and weaknesses, it undoubtedly wields a political influence that has greatly strengthened the mass influence of the Party in every phase of the class struggle.

From 1930 the Party, with the help of the C.I., has earnestly striven to improve its work and overcome some of its greatest defects and weaknesses. It has participated actively in every economic struggle and made improvements in the work of preparation of the economic struggle. It launched a big united front movement in 1930-31, around the demands of the Workers' Charter.

It fought fiercely against the whole policy of the National Government from the day of its inception. The comrades associated with the *Daily Worker* were sentenced to penal servitude for the work of the Party in supporting the Invergordon Mutiny. In the big unemployed battles of the autumn of 1931, the Party played a big part, both in its support of the national unemployed workers' movement and its independent agitation. Scores of our members were arrested in this period, but the work of the Party became increasingly respected, as a result of the activities that were being carried out.

But the Party was still unable to win decisive sections of the reformist workers, we were still unable to prove convincingly that there was an alternative both to the National Government and the propaganda for a third Labor Government. This fact was brought out in an alarming manner by the general election results of 1931.

The National Government swept the country, the Labor vote very heavily declined, but the Communist vote was practically stagnant. This gave rise to serious discussion in our Central Committee and the Communist International. In December, 1931, there was a special discussion with the C.I. on the British situation. This discussion was reported to the Central Committee of the Party, and on its basis, a resolution was drawn up, which is popularly known in our Party as the January Resolution. We consider this resolution one of the most important Party documents, and one that can be accepted now as

an indispensable guide to the whole Party. We will quote from the Resolution because it expresses so clearly what at that time (and to some extent still) were the chief shortcomings of our Party:

"At the same time it must be stated that though the Labor Government for years past has carried out a policy opposed to the interests of the working class it was still able to rally the bulk of the British proletariat (6½ million votes). Our Party, however, did not even succeed in winning over in elections those sections of the workers who were disillusioned with the Labor Party and withheld their votes. We did not understand how to expose before the eyes of the workers the Labor Party's pretense that the policy of British reformism is a weapon in the struggle against the offensive of the British bourgeoisie and a buffer against the attacks on the British working class."

* * *

"During the past months the Party has shown considerable activity in some fields of mass work (unemployed movement and mass demonstrations). But it cannot be sure of any solid influence among the masses unless it sees to it, first, that throughout all its mass work the demarcation in principle between its line and the reformist line is expressed in the clearest terms and, secondly, that its mass influence is rooted above all in the factories and trade unions."

* * *

"The greatest defect in the Party's work during the past few years is that it has not carried on any systematic revolutionary mass work in the reformist trade unions."

* * *

"An end must be put to this situation immediately by making a decisive change in our work. The necessity for this change must be hammered into the consciousness of every Party organ and every single Party member. Without a determined buckling down to the daily systematic struggle with the masses against the reformist trade union bureaucracy in all trade union branches and factories the Communist Party can never become a real mass Party."

* * *

"The entire daily work of the Party, as well as all political and economic movements of the workers under the leadership of the C.P. must be conducted from the standpoint of continual concrete explanation to the workers of the revolutionary way out of the crisis. For this purpose, the Party must make a thorough study of the problems of the revolutionary way out." (C. C. Resolution, January, 1932.)

A big effort was made to get the entire Party mobilized to carry out this resolution, and, while we did not succeed in this entirely, wherever the Resolution was applied immediate gains were recorded, and many invaluable experiences were gained. In particular, it became noticeable that in those meetings where serious efforts were made to show what, concretely, the revolutionary way out of the crisis for the British workers meant, an entirely new meaning and understanding of Communism and the Communist Party became evident. There was a keen desire to discuss the question; good sales of pamphlets, manifestoes, etc., dealing with this were secured.

In trade union work, where it was carried out, successes could be achieved, which only emphasized what could be done if the line of the January resolution were really put into operation by the whole Party. Significant movements were taking place among rank-and-file trade unionists. There were tremendous opportunities before the Party, if there was a really serious effort made to overcome this refusal or reluctance to take part in revolutionary mass work in the trade unions.

Among the unemployed the Party was very active at this time, and in particular during the great hunger march on London in November, 1932. If the same activity could be got in the trade unions, freed either from Right opportunism, legalism or "Left" sectarianism, then it was clear our Party could lead the way for the formation of effective rank-and-file movements in the unions, and the broadening of this work in such a way as to open up splendid prospects for the development of a nation-wide opposition movement that could exert a powerful influence inside the reformist trade unions. It could lead the way in the unification of wage struggles, shorter hours movement, and for the working out of a common lead, policy and strategy, such as would command the support of big sections of trade unionists in every industry.

Accordingly this question was made one of the main ones prior to the Twelfth Party Congress in December, 1933, together with the fundamental questions that arise from the popularization of the revolutionary way out of the crisis.

The Twelfth Congress gave a clear decision on these questions, and serious efforts have since been made to carry the decisions into practice, and good results have been achieved.

The Party has carried out consistent efforts to develop united front activity. The German events in 1933 made a great impression on the British working class. The Party addressed an appeal for united action to the Labor Party, Trade Union Congress, Cooperative Party and I.L.P.

This appeal was distributed in mass quantities all over the country. There was good support among the rank and file, but only the I.L.P. responded to our appeal. The other organizations refused. The Party and the I.L.P. carried out a number of united front demonstrations which met with a warm re-

sponse.* At the same time, many members of the Labor Party began to take part in united front activity, especially in connection with the campaign for the relief of the victims of German fascism, for the release of the Reichstag prisoners and for the release of Comrade Thaelmann.

But the weakness of our united front activity then and now is that not sufficient persistent efforts are made to make contacts with the local Labor Parties, trade union members, Cooperative Guilds, not sufficient endeavor is made to draw them into various forms of mass activity that can lead to wider developments of united front work.

The great possibilities in this direction were strikingly revealed during the hunger march and campaign for the united front congress at Bermondsey this year.

In spite of the ban of the reformist leaders, there was a splendid response by the rank and file of the reformist organizations; in town after town working class organizations gave the marchers a welcome, supported them, appointed delegates to the Unity Congress. The congress itself was a triumph.

The Party had consistently given a lead both to the march and to the congress discussion. It issued a manifesto to the congress that was warmly received, and in this campaign our Party undoubtedly played a leading role and won big influence.

During the march and congress campaign, local unity committees and solidarity committees were being set up everywhere, and there existed tremendous possibilities for the wide extension of the united front. But after the congress and march were over, in spite of a good reporting campaign that was carried out, the typical mistake that has been made time and time again in Britain, has been made again, namely to look on the congress as a thing in itself, and not as the beginning of the campaign that could lead to a united front movement firmly based in the factories and local working class organizations.

Our Party must take its share of responsibility for this situation. The situation was such, that if there had been consistent leadership of the campaign to carry out the congress decisions, nationally, in the districts and localities, I am convinced that by now we would have developed such a movement for united action, that, after the united front agreement in France that has been reached and the general desire there is among the masses for united action, it would have been much more difficult to reject our last appeal for united action made in July to the reformist leaders.

One of the most important tasks now before our Party is to remedy at once this weakness and get the campaign going as never before, especially against the new Unemployment Act, which is such a menace to the unemployed and employed workers. And if this is related to the fight for the winter demands of the unemployed, a new impetus can be given to the whole campaign.

But not only that. Our Party's last united front appeal to the reformist organizations must not be allowed to remain a paper appeal. The refusal of the Labor leaders to take part should not mean the end of the campaign. Their refusal and its implications must be ceaselessly explained to the reformist workers. Close personal contacts should be established with them in the factories, trade unions, local labor parties and Co-op Guilds. These workers can be won for united action, especially can they be won for united activity against fascism.

The events in Germany and Austria have left a lasting impression on the British workers. There is deep resentment at the spineless attitude of the reformist leaders, both in their refusal to fight actively, by every weapon of mass action, the fascist trend of all National Government legislation and repressive acts, and the fascism advocated by Mosley. Against Mosley's Blackshirts there is the bitterest hostility, which is manifested in every industrial town in which he appears and which we believe will reach its high water mark in the anti-fascist demonstration against Mosley on September 9 in London.

The last meeting of our Central Committee gave this question great attention. As we believe, the Party has an opportunity of leading the anti-fascist struggle in such a way as can and will lead to the development of the most powerful and effective forms of united action. We will give the main points of the C.C. resolutions dealing with these questions, as they represent the line which the Party is now actively endeavoring to carry out. The resolution shows the menace of fascism in England as follows:

> "Since the events at Olympia the whole working class movement, as well as wide strata of the petty bourgeoisie, have awakened to the menace of fascism in Britain, of which in the initial stages only the Communist Party gave warning.
>
> "There is still, however, wide-spread confusion on the issues of fascism in Britain."

This confusion follows from the lack of understanding the two-fold character of the fascist attack in England.

> "Finance capital at present backs the National Government as its main weapon for fascization, like Bruening in Germany; but at the same time gives Mosley lavish support, and utilizes his gangs

---

* N. B.—We are not dealing in this article with other questions of the Party and the I.L.P., as they have been the subject of many recent articles in *The Communist International* Magazine.

as a subsidiary weapon, which will be rapidly brought to the front, in proportion as the National Government proves insufficient and if the workers' upward movement continues.

"The National Government offensive and the Mosley offensive supplement each other; the Blackshirts can only operate under the protection of the police, but at the same time can be used, and subsequently disavowed, where it would be inconvenient to use the police."

The resolution states that it is essential to make clear to the workers this two-fold character of the fascist offensive in order to destroy "the 'democratic' illusion, the illusion of the possibility of legal bourgeois-democratic opposition to fascism".

Further the resolution points out concretely the character of the social-fascist role of the reformist Labor leaders, which is not yet sufficiently clear to the workers. The resolution states that "the British Labor Party remains as the only leading party of the old Second International which still maintains the old reactionary policy and prevents the united front of the working class". Concerning the methods of struggle with fascism the resolution states:

"It is not yet widely enough realized that the line of passivity, of trust in legal defenses, of trust in the capitalist State, as preached by the Labor leaders and as was preached by German Social-Democracy, is fatal and can only lead to the victory of fascism; and that only active mass opposition can defeat fascism, already in the early stages, before it is strong.

"But it is no less important for it to be understood that this active mass anti-fascist movement must be a political movement, not merely a specialized defense force, but a political mass movement and campaign, exposing the claims of the fascists, enlightening opinion as to their true character, at the same time as resisting and defeating their violence.

"The immediate demands and slogans of the fight against fascism at the present stage must be: dissolution of the Blackshirt Army! No toleration for Blackshirt hooligan gangs! No extended police powers over meetings and demonstrations! Withdraw the Sedition Bill!"

The resolution points out that,

" . . . the real struggle against capitalism today, both in the economic and in the political field, against the offensive of fascism and war, requires not passive hopes in future electoral victories, but the *mass united front of all the workers* for present struggle.

"This is the central question confronting the British working class today."

The resolution calls to attention the lessons of the events in Germany and Austria, calls upon the workers to follow the example of France, where the pressure of all active workers (Socialist and Communist) destroyed the resistance of the Social-Democratic leadership to the formation of the united front. "The example of the French working class is a model to the workers of the world."

The resolution states:

"The resistance of the reformist Labor leadership must be and can be overcome by the pressure of the entire working class. The united front must be achieved in Britain. The entire future of the British working class struggle hangs on this.

"The new appeal of the Communist Party to the Labor Party and to the Trade Union Congress and to all working class organizations for the united front against fascism and war initiates the most important campaign of the present period. All forces must be thrown into this campaign, into tireless all-pervading agitation for this demand, especially to bring mass pressure to bear on the coming annual conferences of the Trade Union Congress and Labor Party, which must be led to victory by the universal pressure of the working class.

"The aim of the united front campaign must be, not merely the holding of joint demonstrations and agitation, but the building of a mighty all-embracing mass organization capable of fighting the offensive of fascism and war.

"This mass front against fascism and war must embrace, not only the working class organizations as the central core, but all unorganized workers, and all elements of the petty bourgeoisie, employees, small traders, technicians, professionals, intellectuals, students and even bourgeois liberal elements that are prepared to enter into the common fight against fascism and war under the leadership of the working class.

"The existing wave of feeling must not be allowed to ebb away, but must be utilized to lead to lasting organization.

"The anti-fascist front should be built up at a wide all-embracing Anti-Fascist Congress, uniting the political working class parties, the trade unions, the co-operatives, the unemployed organizations, the working class youth organizations, the working class women's organizations, progressive women's organizations, students' organizations, professional groupings, Jewish anti-Hitler groupings, previously existing anti-fascist and anti-war organizations, progressive anti-fascist organizations, etc.

"The core of the anti-fascist front should be built up in the localities, in the factories and in the streets."

We believe that the experiences gained in the period since the Sixth Congress of the C.I. will enable our Party adequately to carry out this line, and at the same time eradicate some of the existing

weaknesses of our Party work; to make a final break with being closed in and with our ideological and political narrowness, to strive for more effective preparation and participation in economic struggles; to achieve a quicker reaction to all political events and give the correct and timely lead to the workers on these events; to improve the content and circulation of the *Daily Worker,* and to transform our agitation and propaganda into the most powerful weapons for winning the workers to the Communist Party.

In this connection, we believe the Party program that is now being drafted and discussed will fulfil a big omission in our Party work. Its publication and popularization will be the means of clearly demonstrating that there is an alternative to the policy of the National Government and of the Labor Party, that the revolutionary way out of the crisis is the only concrete and practical solution of the problems facing the workers today.

In the fight against imperialist war and for the defense of the Soviet Union, the Party has carried out a consistent struggle to rouse the masses for action. It has given the fullest support both to the Friends of the Soviet Union and the anti-war movement. In the campaign and war of Japan in Manchuria and China, the Party has shown the meaning of this predatory action, not only as the beginning of the redivision of the world markets and the opening of a new imperialist war, but as constituting the most deadly menace to the Soviet Union, in which Japan has been acting in the closest conjunction with the National Government.

Against the war preparations of the National Government, the Party has been active, but after reviewing all that has been done by meetings, conferences, *Daily Worker,* leaflets and pamphlets, it all falls far short of what the acute war situation demands.

We have not succeeded in getting one short protest movement in any munitions factory, at any rail depot or seaport, handling munitions. We have seen splendid anti-war conferences such as those at Bermondsey in 1933, and the Youth Anti-War Conference in Sheffield in 1934, but the above outstanding fact of our inability to get a single stoppage of munitions, especially those going to the Far East, is a disquieting fact, when one remembers the speed and rapidity with which war is being prepared by the National Government, and the present provocative acts of Japan in the Far East, against the Soviet Union.

Such a situation must spur the Party to redouble its efforts, especially in the munitions and transport centers, to rouse the workers to an acute realization of the war danger, and the need of knowing how to fight war before it breaks out. In this connection there is a great need to obtain better and more concise information of what is going on in the war factories. Where the munitions are going, what they consist of, their death-dealing capacity, so as to maintain a constant fire of publicity on this question, and also afford more concrete opportunities of concentration at particular factories and transport depots. It is necessary to stress time and time again the experiences of the last war; the international effects of the stopping of the Jolly George in 1920, and how such a repetition today would have the most tremendous effects throughout the world.

A ten-minute protest stoppage in a war factory making munitions for Japan, or a short hold-up on the railways or at the docks, would have incalculable effects, and would soon lead to more effective forms of action in the fight against imperialist war and in defense of the Soviet Union. Such forms of action would be worth a hundred meetings and conferences, and to achieve this is now one of the most urgent tasks before our Party and the anti-war movement.

There must also be a better popularization of the peace policy of the Soviet Union, this enormous weapon in our hands which is the chief factor in the international situation retarding war and giving the whole working class the badly needed time to prepare to meet the deadly menace of war.

But the biggest and most serious weakness of the Party must also now be resolutely overcome: this is the slow growth of the Party. The problem is not the *hostility* of the masses to Communism, is not the obstacles and difficulties placed in our way by the existence of reformist illusions—the slow growth of the Party is our responsibility. Until from top to bottom of the Party, there is the convinced determination and desire to recruit for the Party, no progress will ever be made.

As it is, recruiting for the Party seems always to be an afterthought, even if that. We don't feel sufficiently alarmed at the numerical weakness of the Party, and this is all the more serious when there is such an interest in Communism, when the influence and prestige of the Party stand higher than at any time since its formation. When our meetings are well attended, financial response good, our leads being carried out by an increasing number of workers, when in important districts like London, Glasgow and South Wales our Party is now a definite political factor in the life of these places, it is a matter of grave and serious concern that in these circumstances the membership does not increase by leaps and bounds.

The fault is entirely ours. The coming discussions must sharply emphasize that at all costs an end must be put to such an intolerable situation. Once inside the ranks of the Party itself, *the will* to recruit out of every phase of daily activity is there, then the recruits will speedily be found, and the Communist

Party develop into a real mass Party heading the whole struggle of the working class.

The resolution of our August Plenum represents a really serious effort to give a clear lead on the present situation and some of the most important problems that face the Party. Let us note its concluding words:

> "The entire work of the Party is directed towards development of revolutionary leadership and mass organization in preparation for the decisive revolutionary issues which we know to be in front.
>
> "For this reason all the work of the Party, both great and small, must be imbued with this understanding and perspective, with awakening the workers to the necessity of the revolutionary path as the sole solution to the crisis, the path of the working class revolution and Soviet Power.
>
> "The united front, which is the necessary next stage in the advance of the working class struggle in Britain, is itself only a stage to the further mass advance to the overthrow of capitalism in Britain.
>
> "To this developing battle, leading to the final victory of Socialism, the Communist Party calls the working class."

LENIN ON BRITAIN

By V. I. LENIN

Introduction by Harry Pollitt

All of Lenin's writings on Britain and the British working class movement arranged according to subject, with explanatory notes.

THE CONDITION OF THE WORKING CLASS IN BRITAIN

By ALLEN HUTT

The conditions of labor in the principal industrial areas of England are vividly described on the basis of first-hand investigation and all official sources of information.

$2.00

THE COLONIAL POLICY OF BRITISH IMPERIALISM

By RALPH FOX

From the first steps in the conquest of India and the opening of Africa to the present time in the light of the class struggle in Britain and the independent movements in the East.

75 cents

THE CLASS STRUGGLE IN BRITAIN IN THE EPOCH OF IMPERIALISM

By RALPH FOX

Part I: 1886-1914 Part II: 1914-1923

25 cents each

FROM CHARTISM TO LABORISM

By THEODORE ROTHSTEIN

The historical roots of the present Labor Party are revealed and analyzed in this book, which covers nearly 100 years of the economic and political organization of the British working class.

$2.50

THE WAR FOR THE LAND IN IRELAND

By BRIAN O'NEILL

Introduction by Peader O'Donnell

A survey of the movement for Irish independence as expressed in the land struggles of the Irish peasantry from the 18th century to the present day.

75 cents

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 East 13th Street) New York City

THE HISTORIC PATH OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL

By M. ZORKY

I.

THE First International existed for less than ten years, but it left deep traces on the history of mankind. For the Bolsheviks, for the Comintern, this ten-year period is not simply an episode from the far-distant past of the Western-European workers. For us, it is the initial chapter of our own history, the first stage in the development of the *international Communist Party.*

The embryo of such a Party was the Communist League, an organization founded by Marx in the 40's of last century. The great *Manifesto of the Communist Party* was the first link in the chain of the program documents of international Communism. But the Communist League only united a handful of the advanced elements of the working class. It required the experience of the Revolution of 1848, the trials of the epoch of reaction in the 50's, the new upsurge of the working class movement in England and on the Continent for the *International Workingmen's Association to rise* on the crest of this wave.

Why did this world historic event, the formation and the first stage of development of the revolutionary proletarian International, take place in the 60's and the beginning of the 70's of last century? The explanation, of course, is to be found in the special features of the very *epoch of the First International.*

The beginning of this epoch found the various countries of Western Europe and America at various stages in the development of their productive forces. The English bourgeoisie had carried through their industrial revolution, and, reaping the fruits of it, had reached the zenith of their world commercial and industrial pre-eminence. In France the industrial revolution was in full swing, but it took its own peculiar path in connection with the clearly marked usurious character of French capitalism. In Germany the death throes of handicraft production were approaching, and manufacture was rapidly and extensively developing. The industrial revolution still lay ahead. In the U.S.A., the abolition of slavery loosened the soil for the development of capitalism at unparalleled "American" speed.

But, notwithstanding the varying economic levels attained by the various countries, the general "cosmopolitan" tendency of bourgeois economy stood out more plainly than ever before throughout the *entire* capitalist world. *All* these countries were more closely connected than ever before with the development of the *world* market. In its range, the crisis of 1857 was the first *world* crisis. The *Foundation Manifesto* had good reason to begin with a description of all the contradictions of this "golden age of free trade". To use Lenin's words: "The years 1860-1870 marked the *highest and extreme stage* in the development of free competition" (Lenin, *Works,* Vol. 19, Russian Edition, our italics). In this epoch, capitalism reached its apogee in its classic, pre-imperialist stage.

These, however, were the years which *completed the era of the bourgeois revolutions of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.* After the revolution of 1848, the bourgeoisie still had their work uncompleted. The reaction of the 50's by no means put a stop to the increase in the economic power of this class. The relics of feudal rubbish hindered this growth more and more as time went on. Taught by their experience of 1848, the bourgeoisie would not and could not sweep this rubbish from their path by "plebian methods". They knew that the proletariat had taken its place on the world stage of history, as a class. The epoch of the First International was marked by a new upsurge of the revolutionary movement of the working class. Its historic role as the driving force of all the democratic and national emancipation movements was already in evidence. The proletariat had already openly declared the class war on the bourgeoisie. In France it required the terror of the Versailles troops to ensure that what became consolidated on the ruins of the Second Empire was not the dictatorship of the lower strata of the people in the shape of the Commune, but the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie in the shape of the Third Republic. Faced with the menace of the proletariat, the bourgeoisie in a number of other countries made peace with the landowners. Countries like Spain and Austria also underwent serious changes. The British bourgeoisie also had to resort to reforms so as to strengthen their class domination.

It was *only the upsurge* of the revolutionary working class movement that drove the ruling classes to make reforms, to make "revolutions from above". In his recent talk with Wells, Comrade Stalin ironically exposed the legend of the possibility of a "peaceful" path of development, clearly emphasizing the unbreakable connections existing between bourgeois reformism and the revolutionary onslaught of the masses.*

---

* Interview of Comrade Stalin and H. G. Wells printed in *The Bolshevik*, Moscow, No. 17, 1934.

Had there been no danger of popular revolution, of revolution "from below", we would not have witnessed the picture of black-hundred Junker Prussia, and soldier- and priest-ridden Sardinia assuming the roles of unifiers of bourgeois Germany and bourgeois Italy. Had there not been the revolutionary onslaught of the democratic rank and file, and primarily of the proletariat, Bismarck, the personification of the big landlords, would not have been the greatest "hero" of the bourgeoisie. The epoch of the First International was the epoch of the completion of the bourgeois revolutions, a completion which took place *in circumstances where the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie became sharpened, and resulted therefrom.*

This epoch in which the bourgeois-national "fatherlands" took shape was an epoch of *wars.* In the third quarter of the nineteenth century the following wars took place (apart from small wars): the Crimean, the Austro-Italian-French, the Civil War in America, the Polish rising, the Austro-Prussian and the Franco-German wars. In these wars some States disappeared from the face of the earth, others appeared, and old State boundaries were remade.

By the beginning of the 60's, the proletariat in a number of countries began more and more determinedly to tear off the bonds attaching them to bourgeois-liberalism, and began to come forward with ever greater determination as an independent class force. The conditions of the epoch, an epoch of the unparalleled development of international economic contacts, an epoch of national movements and wars, favored, as Engels wrote, *the cosmopolitan interests* of the working class coming to the forefront during these years.

But all these conditions were not sufficient for the international party of the revolutionary proletariat to be formed. "One element of success they [the working class] possess, numbers"; wrote Marx in the *Foundation Manifesto.* "But numbers weigh only in the balance if united by combination and led by knowledge". Before the First International, the workers were revolutionary by the class *instinct;* they had to be given class *consciousness* and a class fighting *organization.* Marx solved both of these tasks.

In the First International, the international working class made its historic transition *from utopian to proletarian science,* and at the same time *from being scattered and sectarian to having a proletarian party outlook.* This is the great historic service of the International Workingmen's Association, for which it is entirely beholden to Marx. In the person of Marx, the world proletariat found not only a talented theoretician but also its recognized strategist, its mighty organizer, its genuine *leader,* found the "quiet, prompt, well-thought out *leadership,* which on more than one occasion preserved it from long wanderings on false paths".*

II.

In the 50's, in the epoch of reaction, Marx kept himself apart from emigrant groupings, tirelessly working out his theory, and never for a single day ceasing his stubborn struggle against the "great men in emigration", the petty-bourgeois babblers and disorganizers.

Marx always determined his strategy and tactics by an "objective consideration of all the relations of all the classes of the given society without exception, and therefore a consideration of the objective degree of development of this society".**

Better than anybody else in his time Marx was able to see the new features introduced by the epoch of the 60's. That was why Marx "changed" his former tactics, and came to St. Martins Hall on September 28, 1864. He understood quite well that "real forces"*** had come into motion, that "we are dealing with history on which we can have a considerable influence".**** This was why Marx came forward in September-November, 1864, as the founder of the International Workingmen's Association, the author of its program documents, and the leader of all its political and organizational activity.

Marx and Engels saw the historic mission of the International in that it should organize the proletarian masses and lead them to the struggle for the proletarian dictatorship, and for the establishment of socialist society. The *Foundation Manifesto* announced the "winning of political power", as the "greatest duty of the working class". The basic political line pursued by Marx and Engels in the First International was set out with the greatest clearness and simplicity by Engels in his speech at the London Conference in 1871.

> "We want the destruction of classes. What are the means of securing this? The political domination of the proletariat. . . . But the highest act of politics is revolution. Those who recognize this must strive towards such means and political actions as will prepare the revolution, such as educate the workers for revolution, and without which the workers will always be tricked by Favrams and Piats the day after the battle. The Policy which should be followed is a worker's policy. A Party must be formed not as an appendage to some bourgeois parties, but as an in-

---

* Engels, Letter to Bernstein, March 14, 1883. (re-translated from Russian.)

** Lenin, *Works,* Vol. 18.

*** Letter of Marx to Engels, November 4, 1864. (Re-translated from the Russian.)

**** Letter of Marx to Weidemeyer, November 29, 1864. (Retranslated from the Russian.)

dependent party with its own aim, its own policy." (This speech has been published for the first time in the Russian edition of *The Communist International.*)

In trying to form such a Party, Marx first and foremost set himself the task of directing the working class movement in various countries into the channel of common struggle, and uniting it in the ranks of the International. In order to understand what incredible difficulties stood in the path of such unity, we must give ourselves a plain picture of what the working class movement of the time resembled in the West-European countries. Each of the sections of this movement which came into the ranks of the International brought with it whole mountains of petty-bourgeois rubbish, childish illusions, doctrinaire fancies, sectarian impatience, and national prejudices. In order to cope with this babel confusion of tongues, what was needed was Marx's profound understanding of the special features of the development of the proletariat in each of these countries, and Marx's supreme mastery of tactics—the ability to distinguish the positive features which distinguished the various movements from one another and to make them the common property of the International; the ability patiently to expose in the course of the struggle the reactionary Utopias of each and every sect; the ability to see support in the healthy proletarian instinct and growing militant experience of the rank and file, against the limitations and fanaticism of sectarian leaders; the ability to differentiate the ranks of opponents, to isolate the incorrigible, and in the last instance to squeeze them out of the International.

Marx operated these tactics brilliantly throughout the entire history of the Association, which ensured the triumph of Marxism in the First International.

Marx had very few consistent followers in the International, nevertheless Marxism triumphed over all the forms of pre-Marxian socialism. The "secret" of this victory consists, of course, not only of the fact of the tactical genius of Marx. The tactics of Marx led to victory

> ". . . because Marxism and only Marxism represents the really *general and fundamental* interests of the proletariat, because Marxism alone was for this reason capable of rallying the scattered forces of the proletariat into one and thus becoming the *living representative* of the community of interests which unites the workers."*

III.

In the International, Marx had most of all to carry on a struggle against the liberal trade union politicians, against the Proudhonites and against the Bakunin "Alliance".

In the 60's there was already an aristocracy of labor in England, and it received crumbs from the monopolist super-profits of the English bourgeoisie. Marx repeatedly wrote that the England of that period could not be "simply put on a level with other countries. It must be regarded as the *metropolis of capital.*" The period following the year 1848 was a period of unparalleled growth, "intoxicating" growth, to use the words of Gladstone, of British power and wealth. It was just in this period that England became the workshop of the world, and master of the world market. For the International to become a really decisive revolutionary force, the metropolis of capital, in the opinion of Marx, had also to become the citadel of the international proletarian party.

But after the decline of Chartism, the English labor movement remained like a ruined temple, the parts of which were in no way connected with one another. The striving towards legalism at any cost became dominant in the trade union movement. The trade unions even held aloof from strikes. All participation in political life seemed to them to be a deadly sin, many of the unions and rules prohibiting their members from taking part in politics. Even the bourgeois politician Cobden characterized the state of the English workers at that time as a condition of "political dullness".

The starting point of the change was the strike movement of 1859-61. It awakened the working masses and shook the illusion of "class harmony". Trade union councils emerged out of the strike committees with a tendency to become the centers of the proletarian struggle. The bourgeoisie replied to this turn in the labor movement with a crusade against the working class. They drew out of their arsenal the tried weapon of the lockout. The government declared war on the trade unions, deprived their funds of legal protection, and passed a series of laws which, taken together, constituted exceptional law directed against the trade unions. At the same time the bourgeoisie began to practice a new method of struggle in case of strikes, namely, the import of strike-breakers from the continent.

The trade unions, which had taken a solemn oath not to stain their banners with politics, were brought by the course of events face to face with the choice of either going under or of taking up the political struggle. But once they had taken this path, the English workers could not maintain their former aloofness from questions of international politics, especially in the conditions existing in the 60's. Thus it was that the leaders of the trade unions belonged to the General Council of the First International.

Marx never over-estimated the reliability of his English confreres in the International. "The English dogs among the trade unions, for whom we are going too far", wrote Marx in 1867 to Engels, (re-trans-

* *Alliance de la democratic Socialiste*, London, 1873.

lated from the Russian,—*Ed.*), "have run to us"; they keep aside from the International "until they get into difficulties, and only then do they come for help." In their first appeal to the French workers, Odger and Co. emphasized with sufficient deliberateness that as far as they were concerned a circumstance of primary importance which urged them along the path of international unity was the danger of the import of labor power from the continent. They needed the International both as an ally in their struggle for the legal rights of the trade unions, and for electoral reform. The liberal labor politicians would not have been averse to converting the General Council into an international committee for the defense of the English trade unions.

Marx, on the contrary, strove to force the leaders of the trade unions to carry out the line of the International in England. The very participation of these people in the Association was a deviation from "pure" trade unionism. The task facing Marx was to influence the English labor movement through these people until the old leaders would be replaced by others, and to urge it along the revolutionary path. "If we had left in disgust owing to these people," wrote Marx to Siegfried Meyers, "we should only have strengthened their influence, which is paralyzed at the present time by our presence." (Re-translated from the Russian,—*Ed.*)

On this path, Marx obtained big successes. It is true that he was unable to liberate the British labor movement from the guardianship of the liberal trade unionists, and to bring it back again to the Chartist path. But the revolutionary leadership of Marx and the General Council laid a clear imprint on the class struggles waged by the English proletariat in the 60's, in which connection it is sufficient to call to mind the movement for reform and the Irish question. At the same time, Marx in the International formed support for himself among the Englishmen on the chief questions of his struggle against Proudhonism, and to a certain degree against Bakuninism. In the celebrated discussion in the General Council with the Owenite Weston, Marx utilized the experience of the English trade unions to make a brilliant drive on two fronts, both against the denial of the importance of the trade unions, and against the tendency to reduce the whole of the struggle of the working class to the narrow economic struggle within the bounds of the trade union movement. Marx succeeded in ensuring that the positive experience of the trade unions became the property of the whole International, while he utilized the support of the revolutionary elements of the Continental sections to resist successfully the repeated attempts of he rade unioniss to influence the political line of the International as a whole in an anti-revolutionary spirit.

IV.

In France, the International was at first represented by the *Proudhonists.* Like the English liberal politicians, the Proudhonists of Paris revised one of the important points of their symbol of faith by the very fact of their participation in the International.

This, however, was not their only deviation from orthodox Proudhonism. The 60's brought an upsurge of the working class movement in France as well. In the conditions of the Second Empire, the beginning of this upsurge indirectly reflected itself in such phenomena as, firstly, the attempts to inculcate social-Bonapartism into the labor movement, a French variety of Zubotovism; secondly, in the attempts of the Left bourgeois republican elements to take hold of the working class movement, and subordinate it to the interests of their own struggle against the regime of Napoleon; and finally, in the evolution of the Proudhonites, in their gradual abandonment of the line adopted by their teacher. This evolution, however, did not save them from complete destruction when the decisive struggle broke out between Marxism and Proudhonism.

Proudhon was a clear and conscious representative of the strivings of the disintegrating petty bourgeoisie of the town and village, and, what is more, he represented not the revolutionary, but the *conservative* tendencies of these strata. He himself complained that he was regarded as one who destroyed, whereas his task in life was to "put an end to revolutions" in a peaceful manner.

Proudhon, the author of the winged words "property is theft", was in reality a zealous supporter of property. His promised land was the kingdom of the small commodity producer. The peasants need land as their inviolable unquestioned property—"not rent, not an irregular liaison, but marriage with the land". The root of all evils lay not in the sphere of production, but of exchange. The exchange bank and cheap credit—such were the alpha and omega of Proudhonism, the main mechanism of Proudhonite social transformations.

The French petty bourgeoisie were becoming more and more convinced that the July monarchy, the bourgeois republic, and the Second Empire were all openly helping the concentration of capital, *i.e.*, the doom of the small producer. Every government was the "scourge of God". But Proudhon considered as fruitless all attempts to democratize this hated machine, still less to smash it. He advocated the passive boycott of the government, the solution of the social problam "apart from the State and outside it", outside the sphere of all political struggle whatever.

True to the outlook of the petty owner, Proudhon demanded that woman should not dare to tear herself away from the kitchen and the cradle. But the

class essence of Proudhonism was most clearly marked when questions of the proletarian struggle came up. Proudhon was against wage increases, against the limitation of the working day, against strikes, and against the right to form trade unions. The petty bourgeoisie is incapable of forming its united class party. Proudhon damned the very idea of party membership. The Party is "born of tyranny".

But, under the influence of the circumstances prevailing in the beginning of the 60's, Proudhon himself was compelled to admit the importance of the political struggle, and began to preach the alliance between "village democracy" and urban "hired labor". He had in view such an "alliance" between the working class and the petty bourgeoisie wherein the former was on the leading strings of the latter, and, what is more, the aim of this "alliance" was to remain the same—"to reorganize property along the principle of mutuality", "to put an end to day wages and drive out the town profiteer", *i.e.,* to perpetuate petty commodity production.

How was this *bourgeois socialism* (this was the estimate of the teachings of Proudhon, given as far back as in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*), able to become the banner of certain of the workers of Paris? Proudhonism found fertile soil among the highly skilled semi-handicraft proletariat who were engaged mainly in the manufacture of articles of luxury and in the art industry. Reflecting the conservative utopianism of such surroundings, Tolain, Fribour and Co. came to the International with all their Proudhonite baggage. They brought with them their opposition to labor legislation, their plans for world credit, and a panicky fear of politics and Communism. At the first two Congresses—in Geneva in 1866 and Lausanne in 1867, the influence of the Proudhonites was so great that, to use the words of Marx, they "nearly spoiled everything" and it was only "owing to the true instinct of the workers" that they did not paint all the decisions of these congresses a Proudhonite color.

The Parisian Proudhonites were driven into the International by the strivings of the French workers towards the political struggle and international solidarity, which of itself contained the inevitable death sentence on Proudhonism. Tolain and his friends comforted themselves with the hope that they could convert the entire International into something like an international doctrinaire league which manufactured recipes for social renovation, or into a world-wide mutual credit association. "The association as a whole", wrote Fribour, "definitely refrains from any interference in the affairs of France. It is an association for investigation." (Translated from Russian—*Ed.*). Is it surprising that the Proudhonites estimated the entire subsequent development of the International as a deviation from the correct path? In this they were in touching unity with the Bonapart police.

Marx, however, in accordance with his entire tactics at this time, set himself the task of getting into contact with the French workers through the medium of the Proudhonites, and of leading them along the path of the International, that is to say, through the medium of the Proudhonites, as long as this was necessary, but over their heads and *against* them when this became possible. These tactics led to excellent results.

The entire first period in the history of the International was filled with the struggle of Marxism against the Proudhonites. Marx based himself in this struggle both on the English labor movement with its experience of powerful trade unions and extensive political struggle, and on the German labor movement, where social-democracy had begun to take shape at the time, and also on all those elements in the French labor movement itself which were able to weaken Proudhonism and open up possibilities for the International directly influencing the masses of the French proletariat.

In these stubborn struggles against Proudhonism which were conducted by Marx on the question of property, *i.e.,* of Socialism, on the question of the political and economic struggle of the proletariat and on the national question, Marx always based himself on the growing class experience of the French workers themselves. In proportion as France drew nearer to revolution, the old Proudhonite utopianism became open strike-breaking. Doctrinaire teachings led by a straight path to treachery. Under the leadership of Marx, the proletariat stepped over Proudhonism. By the time of the Brussels Congress in 1868 and especially the Basle Congress in 1869, Proudhonism had been *destroyed*. "The International of the French founders is dead", stated Fribour sadly. Marx wrote differently to Engels: "We have finished off the Proudhonite asses."

The victory of Marx over the Proudhonites was a victory of proletarian socialism over the bourgeoisie. It sharply emphasized the revolutionary proletarian socialist nature of the Association, and opened up a new stage in the struggle for Marxism in the ranks of the International. After this victory, the opponents of Marxism had to "disguise" themselves as revolutionists and socialists. Bakuninism became the standard-bearer of all the enemies of Marx in the International.

V.

Whereas Proudhonism was the ideology of the small owner, grimly clutching to his property, and not losing the hope of remaking the whole world in his own form or image by peaceful means, *Bakuninism* was the expression of this same property-owner who had already been completely plundered by cap-

italism, and had become declassed and swept into the flood of pauperization.

Bakuninism in Russia appealed to the anarchist-mutinous traditions of the serf-peasantry: in Western Europe it appealed to the bourgeois robbed of his last, to the declassed petty bourgeois.

In England, by that time, the day of these social strata had already passed. In Germany the ruined petty bourgeoisie were speedily swallowed up by rising capitalism. For this reason the influence of the Bakuninites was strongest mainly in the Latin countries of the South, where at that time capitalist development meant not so much proletarianization as pauperism for the perishing handicraftmen and peasants.

The "teachings" of Bakunin are a confused mass in which everything of importance was taken from Proudhon. While completely accepting Proudhon's estimate of the State, Bakunin rejected in words the tactics of the passive boycott and advocated the immediate and violent destruction of all States. As for the proletarian dictatorship, in the opinion of Bakunin "there is only a difference in outward conditions between the revolutionary dictatorship and the state. In essence they are one and the same rule of the majority by the minority. . . . They are *equally reactionary.*"

Instead of the State, what needed to be created was a "free federation" of persons, communes, districts, nations. But all this still lay ahead, and at present "we must give ourselves up to unlimited destruction, constant, unceasing, ever-increasing, until nothing remains for disruption". Bakunin regarded the organized working class not as an advanced section but as a backward one, a hindrance on the path towards general "social liquidation"; he preferred the lumpen proletariat to it, as, firstly, it combined poverty, despair and "revolutionary passion"; then he preferred the poor students—"the educated world of desperate youth"; and finally, he preferred robbers who "preserve the traditions of popular sufferings". Bakunin demanded the destruction of "authoritarianism", *i.e.,* of discipline and centralization in the International itself. In the words of Marx, "at the time when the old world was trying to destroy the International, Bakunin was aiming at replacing its organization by anarchy. The international police asked no more."

Furthermore, Bakunin regarded the existence of a strictly secret and properly organized band of conspirators as being the guarantee for the victory of his "social liquidation". He selected the International as the organization *inside* which, to use his own words, this "invisible dictatorship" should be set up.

After Marx had repulsed the attempt of Bakunin to legalize the "alliance of socialist democracy" inside the International, Bakunin finally took the line of conspiratorial struggle against Marx and the General Council. This was war according to all the rules of factional and double-dealing strategy, including parallel illegal centers, code correspondence, underground literature, negotiations and blocs with openly anti-revolutionary elements, statements regarding the alleged rejection of factional organization, which played the part of a smoke screen, and streams of vile slander against Marx and Engels as the leaders of the International.

Bakunin carried on a frenzied struggle against Marx on three most important questions: (1) The question of the *political struggle of the working class.* Bakunin demanded "abstention from politics"; (2) The question of the *proletarian dictatorship.* As against this, Bakunin counterposed his program of general disintegration; (3) the question of the role of a centralized and disciplined *proletarian party.* Bakunin denied this role with all his "anti-authoritarian" theory, and all his disorganizing conspirative practice.

But it was just these questions that became questions of life and death for the International. At the paricular stage of the movement it was precisely the task of organizing the working class for its political struggle, for its preparation for the oncoming struggles for the proletarian dictatorship, that became *the central task facing* proletarian revolutionaries. This is why those methods which Marx applied in his struggle for Marxism in the International in the years 1864-1869 were unsuitable in the struggle against Bakuninism. This is why the struggle against the Bakuninists was carried on so fiercely, and soon led to a *split,* to the *exclusion* of the anarchists from the ranks of the International.

Marx and Engels gave a shattering criticism of the theory and practice of Bakunin, and this criticism will always be one of the most brilliant pages in the history of Marxism. Marx and Engels showed not only the theoretical pettiness of Bakuninism, but also its strike-breaking essence, its outright reactionary nature hidden behind ultra-revolutionary phrases. In reality Bakuninism backed up supineness and passivity, destroyed the fighting organization of the proletariat and played into the hands of bourgeois counter-revolution.

The opportunist essence of Bakuninism is eloquently shown by Bakunin's favorite slogan, as the old slogan of the St. Simonites, about the abolition of the right of inheritance by legislative means *within the framework of the bourgeois State.* Bakunin considered this measure to be the "starting point" of his general "liquidation". . . . It is not surprising that this slogan of the arch-revolutionary Bakunin met with sympathy among the most avowed reformists.

Whereas Bakunin's "theory" reflected the despair

of the frantic petty bourgeoisie, the pitiful strike-breaking practice of Bakuninism illustrated the complete helplessness of this strata when deprived of proletarian leadership, and the complete fruitlessness of Bakuninism. Three examples will be enough to show this. In the Swiss Jura—the very citadel of Bakunin—the Alpinists could not make any other proposal than the naked advocation of abstention from politics, and a pitiful "positive" program in which such points as mutual credit and unemployment insurance figured as a distant ideal (under the heading: "If you workers wanted it"). In Italy, the Bakuninites organized a ridiculous "rising", in which, instead of the masses, full of "revolutionary passion", only a handful of people took part armed with rifles that would not go off. In Spain, in the rising of 1873, the Bakuninites played a most disgraceful role:

> "As soon as it came to action, the ultra-revolutionary howl of the Bakuninites turned either into shirking or into an obviously hopeless revolt, or into union with a bourgeois party which shamelessly exploited the workers politically. . . . The Bakuninites in Spain gave us an unsurpassed example of how not to make a revolution". *

The descendants and the followers of the Bakuninites in our days show the whole world how the fake radical blather of the anarchists regarding the "destruction of all states" in reality leads to a disgusting groveling to the hangmen of the working class, namely, the Leroux and Robles.

The first conflict with the Bakuninites took place at the Basle Congress of the International in 1869. During the London Conference in 1871, an extremely keen struggle took place, but it was still entitled the "Swiss Conflict". The decisions of the conference, which were directly aimed at the "Alliance", provided the occasion for the Bakuninites to undertake an open splitting campaign against Marx and the General Council. The "Alliance" became the center of attraction for all the oppositional elements in the International. Even some of the trade union leaders rallied to the banner of Bakunin, attracted not so much by the short-lived struggle of the Bakuninites for "social liquidation", as by their much more real struggle for the abolition of the leadership of Marx in the International.

Bakunin *did not succeed* in getting the International into his hands and forcing his program onto it. The Hague Congress in 1872, under the direct leadership of Marx, entirely approved the line of the Marxian General Council, and expelled Bakunin from the Association.

The Bakuninites formed their "anti-authoritarian" International which disappeared ingloriously after a few years of miserable existence. Bakuninism advocated the policy of fireworks, but it proved to be a very brief flash in the pan itself. The victory obtained by Marx in the first International over Bakunism was final and absolute.

VI.

But at that time the International itself was passing through a crisis, the cause of which was much wider and deeper than the influence of the splitting activity of the "Alliance".

The First International was the child of the definite epoch in which it grew, developed, and marched from victory to victory. By the beginning of the 70's, the International Workingmen's Association had achieved enormous successes. The Commune was a tremendous victory for the International. It was a proof that the only path of the working class to victory was that of the proletarian dictatorship, the path of Marx and Engels, the path of the First International. "After the Commune", wrote Engels to Bebel, in regard to the International Association, "it had tremendous success. The bourgeoisie were frightened to death and thought it all-powerful." But the First International was the child of its epoch, and this epoch was coming to an end.

The beginning of the 70's marked a *turning point* in world history. Lenin considered the crisis of 1873 as an important landmark in the history of capitalist economy. * The old capitalism left the highest stage of its development behind. The era of bourgeois revolutions in the West came to an end. In its place there came a transition epoch—"a transition from the completion of the bourgeois and national revolutions in Western Europe to the beginning of socialist revolutions". ** The national bourgeois "fatherlands" took definite shape, frontiers became relatively stable. The map of Europe, which lasted without important changes until 1914, became settled in 1871.

The proletariat was faced with the task of continuing its revolutionary struggle on new grounds. New times demanded different strategy and tactical methods, different organizational forms. The First International fulfilled its historic mission and left the scene. But it left as a *victor* and had "full right to look back with pride on the path it had traversed". (Engels.)

The transfer of the General Council to New York neither meant that the real center of the movement

---

* "The Bakuninites at Work". (Engels, *Works*, Vol. XI., p. 124, Russian Edition.)

* Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XIX, p. 856, Russian Edition.

** Lenin, *Works*, Vol. XVIII., p. 278, Russian Edition.

had been transferred there, nor that such a center had ceased to exist. The leadership of the International proletarian army in the 70's and 80's remained in the hands of Marx and Engels. This leadership was of *decisive* importance for the development of the proletarian socialist parties which were formed at that time. In this way the revolutionary proletarian International *continued to exist*. But Marx and Engels considered that the previous organizational form could be revived only at a much higher stage of the development of the class struggle than that which had been reached in the 60's and 70's. Marx considered the approach of a new "critical market situation" as a necessary prerequisite for this, as he wrote in 1881 to Domel Niuwengus. "The next international will be *Communist*" wrote Engels to Benner.

* * *

As we know, the Second International did not justify these hopes. At the beginning of its historic path it utilized the ground prepared by the First International, and all the subsequent activity of Marx and Engels. It contributed to the unparalleled *expansive* development of the socialist movement, the unparalleled growth of the class organizations of the proletariat. But with the further passage of time, the proletarian parties began to degenerate into parties which were "blocs of proletarian and petty-bourgeois elements". (Stalin.) The Second International departed from Marxism, and when it became bankrupt on this path, it openly abandoned the heritage of Marx, the heritage of the First International.

This does not prevent social-democratic writers from making a few efforts from time to time to distort and belittle the significance of the First International. Some "Marxists" try to depict the great fighting association of the proletariat which called the Commune into being as a toothless propagandist society. Others significantly explain that the First International became "bankrupt" as the result of the Franco-German war, *i.e.*, the international of Marx was just as fragile an "instrument of peace" as the International of Herr Kautsky. In a jubilee article on the 70th Anniversary on September 27, 1934, the Prague *Social-Democrat* stated that the First International "perished owing to the contradictions between the science of the proletariat and the romanticism of insurrection". It is an old song to put a sign of equality between the putschism of Bakunin and the immortal heroism of the Communards, and immediately to compose a tragic "contradiction" between proletarian science, Marxism, and proletarian rising. As if Marxism was something different from the proletarian science of the conditions and ways for a victorious proletarian insurrection.

VII.

In opposition to the distorters and falsifiers in the ranks of social-democracy, the Bolsheviks, the Comintern, Lenin and Stalin always attached tremendous importance to the experience of the First International, the only heir and continuator of which is the international party of Lenin and Stalin—*the Communist International*.

In their estimate of the First International the Communists are infinitely distant from the Menshevik-Trotzkyite treatment of Marxism which grossly distorts Marxist dialectics, and tries to depict matters as if Marx and Engels provide "everything" in a ready-made form necessary for the proletariat in its modern struggle. This sham orthodox, and in reality renegade, trick is only a screen for the denial of the new features which Lenin and Stalin introduced into the treasure house of Marxism, and without which there is not and could not be any Marxism in our times.

The general revolutionary theory of Marx did not and could not contain, or only contained in embryo, in outline, much of that which has later been given to us by Lenin and Stalin, and which represents a further development of Marxism to meet the new epoch, the epoch of imperialism and proletarian revolutions.

But precisely because Lenin and Stalin introduced new features into Marxism, the historical experience of the proletariat is of enormous importance in the light of these new features. The works of Lenin and Stalin are classic examples of the dialectic study of this experience and of its adaptation to the new and higher stage of the struggle. The work and the activity of Marx and Engels are really *inexhaustible sources*. The Communists of all countries must learn to master this experience in a Bolshevik way, including also the rich experience of the Second International, and to use it in a Bolshevik manner in their revolutionary current struggle.

This experience shows, above all, the source of many anti-Communist trends with which we have to cross swords at the present day. There are many among our enemies who are "disguised" as Marxists, but who remain liberal Labor politicians in the spirit of Odger, or who continue the work of Lassalle and Schwitzer. In a number of countries, and primarily in Spain, it is still necessary to carry on the struggle aganst the anarchists. But it would be a mistake to think that reformism, and still more the "Left" critics of the Comintern, are in no way related to anarchism. In the epoch when the proletarian party in Russia was gathering its forces, Lenin repeatedly caught the Mensheviks adopting a typically anarchist attitude to the question of the proletarian party. In 1913, Comrade Stalin wrote that Austro-

Marxism tries to justify its national program by "replacing the Marxist conception by the reformed conception of Bakunin".* During the war, Lenin criticized sharply the mistakes of the Polish and Russian Luxemburgites. The enemies of Marxism are tenacious of life. One of the conditions of victory is to know our own history and the history of the enemy.

The experience of the First International is of particular value for Communists because it makes it possible to study in all its brilliance the activity of *Marx and Engels as the party leaders, as the politicians of the working class.* This activity, in particular, gives classic examples of how to carry on the struggle for the masses, how to carry them with us *even when we are in the minority,* how to carry them forward and higher, on the basis of the experience of their own struggle, utilizing every turn of events, every step of the ruling classes, and every strike. Without hesitating even at a split when necessary, Marx and Engels were tremendous fighters for the revolutionary unity of the proletariat.

In our day the Communists are more than ever before the "living representatives of the community of interests which unites the workers". The Sections of the Comintern in the imperialist countries must more than ever before master the art of carrying the masses with them, an art the brilliant masters of which were Marx and Engels.

* Stalin, *Marxism and the National Question.*

THEORY TO THE MASSES

■

100,000 Copies at 10 cents

FOUNDATIONS OF LENINISM

By Joseph Stalin

This classic, systematic exposition of the teachings of Lenin, published in a Tenth Anniversary Edition at a greatly reduced price, must be given the widest mass distribution among the American working class. Every revolutionary worker should not only buy one himself, but should put copies into the hands of his fellow workers.

●

LENIN'S COLLECTED WORKS

8 Volumes

$8.00

Formerly $23.00

This new, low-priced edition of Lenin's works, printed on good paper and bound in sturdy cloth, contains the same texts as used in the previous edition which sold for $23.00. Over 3000 pages of Lenin's writings on basic strategy, policy, and tactics of Bolshevism. The titles are:

The Iskra Period (two volumes)
Materialism and Empirio-Criticism
The Imperialist War
The Revolution of 1917 (two volumes)
Towards the Seizure of Power (two volumes)

A LENIN SET IN EVERY WORKERS' ORGANIZATION BY DECEMBER 15!

■

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 East 13th Street) New York City

THE QUESTION OF FASCISM

By L. MADYAR

FASCISM, as a product of the general crisis of capitalism, is at the present time a general tendency of the bourgeois power. Mussolini stated at one time that fascism is not a commodity for export, but later he himself denied the authenticity of this statement and repeatedly hinted that fascism is, in reality, a commodity for export—varying, of course, according to the country and its national peculiarities. After the coming to power of the National Socialists in Germany, Goebbels also made the statement that all Europe would become national-socialist within 50 years, but later, for reasons of diplomacy and foreign policy, he repudiated this statement, claiming that national-socialism is a purely German product and not by any means a commodity for export.

But the matter is not decided by the manner in which Mussolini, Goebbels or any other fascist appraises the outlook for fascism or whether he looks upon the fascism of his own country as an export commodity or not. As a method of rule, as a method of saving and preserving bourgeois domination, fascism is not connected with Italian, German, Polish or any other definite soil. It can take root in any capitalist country. For the moment, we will leave aside the question of whether fascism could become a mass movement in colonial countries. Theoretical considerations and the actual course of the movement indicate that fascism cannot become a real mass movement in colonial countries. But in capitalist countries, whether they be industrial or agrarian, the victors or the vanquished in the imperialist war, the big bourgeoisie are looking upon fascism more and more as an almost universal means of saving capitalism, a method applicable to all countries in the period of the general crisis, and therefore it may be said that fascism is a general tendency of the development of bourgeois power.

This, of course, does not mean that fascism is an obligatory stage in the path of the proletariat to power, that the proletariat of all countries will have to undergo the purgatory of the fascist dictatorship. There is only one final guarantee against fascism, fascization and the establishment of the fascist dictatorship, and that is the overthrow of capitalism, which gives birth to fascism. But the unity of action of the proletariat may avert the fascist dictatorship; the proletarian dictatorship may come before the establishment of the fascist dictatorship.

In the post-war period, two big waves of fascization and the establishment of fascist dictatorships should be noted.

The first wave arose at the period of the transition from the first round of wars and revolutions to the temporary stabilization of capitalism. At this period, fascist dictatorships were established in Italy, Hungary and Bulgaria. Later, in 1926, fascism conquered in the special conditions of Poland and Lithuania. This took place actually in the period of the temporary stabilization of capitalism. In Poland and Lithuania themselves, the establishment of the fascist dictatorship was preceded by an extremely acute economic crisis which intensified class relations to an extreme degree, and on these grounds class relations were extremely tense. It was precisely the fact that the fascist dictatorship arose in these countries during the period of the transition from the first round of wars and revolutions to temporary stabilization that made it possible for the fascist dictatorship to stabilize itself temporarily through a series of crises and convulsions.

In the period of the relative stabilization of capitalism, the bourgeoisie did not establish a fascist dictatorship, and the fascist groups, parties and organizations did not even widely develop. Fascism and the establishment of a fascist dictatorship are not only signs of the weakness of the proletariat who have been split by social-democracy but are also a sign of the weakness of the bourgeoisie. It is not because of their strength that the bourgeoisie use fascist methods of government, but as the result of their weakness, as the result of the crisis of the bourgeois power.

The second wave of fascization arose on the basis of the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism in connection with the world economic crisis, in connection with the breakdown of the temporary stabilization of capitalism. This second wave of fascization led to the establishment of fascist dictatorships in Jugoslavia and Finland in 1929, and later to the victory of fascism in a country with such a powerful labor movement as Germany, to the establishment of fascist dictatorships in Austria and Latvia and the coming to power of the bloodthirsty military-fascist clique in Bulgaria.

The second wave of fascization—the establishment of fascist dictatorships in a number of countries—has taken place at the time of transition from the end of stabilization to the second round of revolutions and wars. It is precisely this which makes it certain that in these countries fascism cannot stabilize its terrorist rule.

THE PECULIAR FEATURES OF FASCIZATION

There cannot be the slightest doubt that the victory of fascism in Germany gave a strong urge to the process of fascization in other capitalist countries. But we must not simplify our understanding of this process too greatly. The struggle against fascization and the establishment of correct tactics in the struggle against fascization demand a concrete analysis of the *peculiar features of fascization* in each separate country. The paths and channels of fascization take place differently in the various countries. In general the processes of fascization, evidently, amount to the following:

1. The rise of new fascist parties and the strengthening and enlivening of the activity of the previously existing fascist parties, organizations and groups. After the victory of fascism in Germany we see how new fascist parties and groups sprang up in Switzerland, Holland and Demark, Spain, France, etc., and how the activity of the old parties and groups became enlivened. In Great Britain the Mosley group became unquestionably more active. In France military terrorist fascist organizations such as the "Fiery Cross", "Action Francaise", etc., increased their activity.

2. The process of fascization through the fascization of the old bourgeois parties. It would be a great mistake to think that in Great Britain, for example, the Mosley group is the *only* advocate of fascism. There cannot be the slightest doubt that the die-hard group and the group of Young Conservatives in the Conservative Party, and a number of national labor leaders like Thomas also spread fascist ideology and fascist methods of power in Great Britain. This is not contradicted by the fact that sometimes individual die-hards and Young Conservatives come out against Mosley and his methods, looking upon them as not sufficiently English, condemning the Mosley group for trying to transfer to British soil the foreign methods of Italian fascism and German national socialism. In Great Britain, Parliamentary traditions have taken deep root among the masses, and evidently British fascism will have to pay a certain tribute to these traditions in the sense of sweeping away the institutions of bourgeois democracy under a parliamentary democratic cloak.

In France we may also observe how the old bourgeois parties are more and more adopting the ideology and methods of fascism. This also does not exclude, but on the contrary, sometimes even presupposes, that they will oppose the methods of Italian fascism and German national socialism and will repudiate the attempts of individual fascist groups, small as yet, to transfer Italian and German methods of fascism to French soil. But at the present time, there is no bourgeois party in France which has not raised the question of the reform of the State in some form or other. Moreover, by the "reform" of the State all the bourgeois parties mean the strengthening of the executive power, and, particularly the Right parties, have in view the "dry" or bloodless fascization of the State power.

And what is meant by "dry" fascization in the bourgeois sense of the term? This means the maximum utilization of legal constitutional forms of carrying out the fascization of the State, the utilization as far as possible of parliamentary democratic methods of handing over power to the fascists, the avoidance of the violent seizure of power. It is obvious that "dry" fascization does not exclude, but on the contrary presupposes, the use of violence against the revolutionary proletariat and its Communist vanguard, the repression of the mass organizations of the proletariat. And in reality, the Right parties in France declare their opposition to a fascist *coup d'etat*.

The proposal of Tardieu on the question of government reform is being taken up by all the Right parties, and the idea of dictatorship is penetrating also into the Radical Socialist Party. The "Corporative idea" is extremely popular among the Right bourgeois parties. And it is by no means a contradiction when the supporters of the "reform" of the State put forward demands such as votes for women and proportional representation. It does not prevent many fascists thumping themselves on the chest and solemnly declaring themselves to be supporters of the Republic and civil liberties. National traditions cause the wise French fascists to try to act as the direct heirs of the Jacobins and come to the masses with the slogans of the defense of the Republic, civil rights and other gains of the great French revolution, and to wear the revolutionary cap.

Various small fascist groups have arisen in Sweden. But evidently at the present moment the Conservative Party in that country is probably the main channel and lever of fascization. The process of fascization is also taking place through the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois mass organizations. In this respect, in France for example, the war veterans' association and those processes of fascist ferment which are taking place inside it are naturally of tremendous political importance. It would be foolish and politically harmful to consider that all these organizations are already fascist. But there is no doubt that a fascist ferment is taking place inside these organizations and they may play a big role in deciding whether or not there is to be a fascist dictatorship in France.

In the mass organizations of taxpayers, tenants, small traders and also in the broad mass peasant organizations, the position still remains indefinite. Of course, anti-fascist fighters in France must keep watch on the activity of the "Fiery Cross", "French Solidarity", "Action Francaise", etc. But in France the path of fascization leads through other gates.

In Norway the fascist ferment has embraced a number of peasant organizations, and the Ex-War Minister Klioling is relying on these organizations in particular in his attempt to bring about a fascist coup. Fascist ideas, fascist endeavors are penetrating, to some degree or other, into the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois mass organizations in Switzerland, Holland and a number of other countries. In this respect special attention should be paid to the various war veterans' organizations and reservist societies, the militarized or semi-militarized organizations, and in particular the militarization of the youth, the military and semi-military bourgeois youth organizations.

The appearance of various fascist or semi-fascist groups within social-democracy itself greatly helps fascization. The group of Marquet-Deas in France was recognized by Mussolini himself as a fascist group in its ideology. In Great Britain the Labor Party had the honor and pleasure of advancing Sir Mosley from its camp. In Poland the Yavorski group is quite a good aid to Pilsudski, a group which was also advanced from the P.P.S.

In this respect the most classic example is Japanese social-democracy. There are similar groups, also, in the other parties of the Second International, *e.g.*, in Bulgaria, and in a certain sense in Czechoslovakia, although these groups have not yet begun to exist apart from social-democracy in these countries.

From this point of view, the infection of a large number of reformist trade union leaders with the corporative ideology is of no small importance. This is accompanied by the attempts of a number of reformist leaders to carry on a certain political division between the Social-Democratic Parties and the reformist trade unions, so that if anything happens it will be easier to include the trade unions in the State apparatus. Leipart and Co. were late in this attempt. There is no doubt that the tendency towards a certain division between the reformist unions and the Social-Democratic Parties and towards a still greater rapprochement between the reformist trade unions and the employers' organizations, between the unions and the bourgeois State, has increased of late in the unions affiliated to the Amsterdam International.

Finally, an extremely important path, an extremely important channel, is the fascization of the State apparatus itself. Government emergency decrees in France and Belgium, reactionary laws in Holland and Spain, a series of reactionary measures in Great Britain, not to mention the process of fascization in Czechoslovakia, show that in the so-called bourgeois democratic States there is a rapidly growing tendency to strengthen and centralize the executive power, to cut down the real and imaginary rights of the institutions of bourgeois democracy, of parliamentarism, to cut down the democratic rights and liberties of the working class and all the toilers. There is an increase in terror against the revolutionary working class movement, a restriction of the rights and functions of the mass organizations of the working class, and first and foremost of the trade unions.

At the present time the social-democrats are attempting to draw a contrast between the countries with a fascist dictatorship, and the democratic countries. But there is no impassable gulf between the countries of bourgeois democracy and the countries of fascist dictatorship, and the paths of transition from countries of bourgeois democracy to countries of fascist dictatorship are so varied and so peculiar that it would be difficult to establish any boundary, any impassable gulf between the countries of fascism and countries of so-called bourgeois democracy. But in the fascization of the bourgeois State a very important point is the fascization of the police, the army, the armed forces of the bourgeois State. It is no accident that in France the fascization of the Parisian police and in Great Britain the "reorganization" of the London police were the first care of the bourgeoisie.

In the conditions of the sharpening of the general crisis of capitalism and the breakdown of the relative stabilization of capitalism, the fascist tendencies in the camp of the monopolist bourgeoisie undoubtedly have become stronger in all countries, and the victory of fascism in such a big industrial country as Germany has undoubtedly whipped up the process of fascization in other capitalist countries also. In this sense and only in this sense can we speak of fascism as an international phenomenon, as the general tendency of the bourgeois power.

But the dreams of the fascists about a fascist international remain but dreams. It has been tested and proved by experience that fascism is incapable of creating an international organization. Moreover, the victory of fascism in some countries intensifies the contradictions between the imperialist powers. Fascism is even unable to organize an anti-Soviet bloc of all the imperialist powers. Hitler, Goebbels, Hess, Mussolini and Pilsudski have plenty to say about the solidarity of veterans, but there cannot be any such solidarity in the fascist sense. Solidarity between ex-servicemen is only possible on the basis of proletarian internationalism. Nationalism and chauvinism cannot be internationalism. At present the Italian fascists are giving a practical lesson to the German Nazis that there is not and cannot be a fascist international. The struggle of German and Italian imperialism around Austria, the events of July 25, the mobilization of Italian troops after the murder of Dollfuss, the frantic mutual attacks of the Italian fascists and the German National Socialists, have shown what fascist solidarity is worth.

The German National Socialists have made every effort to form the widest possible anti-Soviet bloc

in Tokyo, Warsaw and London and have received no small amount of sympathy for their efforts. But, among other things, the policy of German fascism, its armaments, provocations, military preparations and annexationist plans have compelled a number of bourgeois States to seek the collaboration of the U.S.S.R. in the struggle against the outbreak of a new war.

The victory of fascism in Germany accelerated the process of fascization in the capitalist countries. There is not the slightest doubt that the enormous economic, social-political and foreign political difficulties of German fascism, the crisis of the fascist rulers of Germany, the beginning of the crisis of German fascism, in short all the processes which received clear expression on June 30, struck a heavy blow not only at German fascism but also at the fascist parties and groups in the various capitalist countries. In this respect June 30 is a kind of landmark not only in the history of the fascist dictatorship in Germany, but is also of international significance.

It was no accident that after June 30, Lord Rothermere in Great Britain refused to support the Mosley group. It was no accident that the fascist groups and organizations in France, Spain, Switzerland and Scandinavia received a definite blow as the result of the events of June 30 in Germany. It is no accident that after June 30 such a prominent publicist of French fascism as Carrillier absolutely repudiated the use of the methods of German fascism in France. In Scandinavian countries, particularly in Denmark and Sweden, the beginning of the crisis of German fascism in a certain sense strengthened the position of the social-democratic governments which were in power. There is no doubt that the enormous difficulties and convulsions which German fascism is approaching will have an effect on the development of the fascist groups, organizations and parties in other countries. In the countries where the aristocracy of labor, which forms the chief basis of social-democracy, has been least undermined, where the ruin of the petty bourgeoisie is taking place at a more even speed and in less catastrophic forms, that is to say, in the countries where there are still certain possibilities of ruling the country by the methods of bourgeois democracy, fascism naturally develops more slowly. The decay of bourgeois democracy in these countries is taking place at a lower speed.

But the fact of the matter is that the sharp intensification of the general crisis of capitalism is ever more undermining these possibilities. The bourgeoisie are passing from social reforms to their destruction, from imperialist pacifism to war preparations, from democracy to fascism.

But it would be extremely dangerous to overestimate the influence of the German events on the development of fascism in other countries. There can be no doubt that in a number of western and Scandinavian countries at the present time there is a certain degree of caution even in the camp of the bourgeoisie who are approaching fascism, in respect to the use of the methods of the fascist dictatorship of the German type in these countries. There is no doubt that after June 30 there arose a certain bias in favor of "dry" fascization in the camp of the bourgeoisie who were moving towards fascism. As far as concerns the countries where bourgeois democracy has fairly deep historic traditions even among the petty bourgeoisie, where parliamentarism is deep rooted, the big monopolist bourgeoisie have evidently taken the line of "dry" fascization at the present moment. How long this will last is another question, and this question will be decided by the development of events not so much in Germany as by the development of events in these countries themselves. It must be taken into account, in this connection, that the growth of the elements of fascization in any country does not remove the danger of a fascist coup, but, on the contrary, brings it nearer.

Therefore, in our opinion, the decisive influence of the German events is not in the influence they had in the camp of the fascist bourgeoisie in other capitalist countries. Their decisive importance lay in the fact that the establishment of a fascist dictatorship in Germany, the establishment of a fascist dictatorship in Austria, the heroic struggle of the Austrian proletariat against the fascist dictatorship, aroused the workers to strengthen the struggle against fascization, increased the strivings towards unity among the proletariat who had been split by social-democracy, stimulated the struggle of the working class against fascism and against fascization.

There cannot be the slightest doubt that from the point of view of international results, the most decisive and most remarkable thing is that the victory of fascism in Germany and Austria urged along the process of fascization in the other capitalist countries, and the most remarkable and important thing is that this victory of fascism in Germany and Austria, etc., did not cause the international workers' movement to recede, but, on the contrary, it increased the strivings of the workers towards unity, increased the struggle of the working class against fascism and fascization.

If fascism had not conquered in Germany, there would have been no February 6 in France, the first open mass action of fascism. But if the French proletariat had not seen by experience what sufferings and what oppression are brought by fascism, the working class of France would not have offered such brilliant resistence to fascism as took place during the general strike on February 12, in the barricade fights, the street demonstrations, etc.

The armed struggle of the Austrian workers, the February events in France, the general strike in France,

the barricade fighting in a number of proletarian centers in France, the mass political strikes against fascism in Spain, the workers' demonstrations against fascism in Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, etc., the wave of strikes which swept over a number of European countries in the spring, show that the victory of fascism in Germany did not cause depression in the international working-class movement, but, on the contrary, mobilized the working masses for the anti-fascist struggle, made a breach in the barriers which separated the social-democratic, Communist and non-party workers, and introduced a tremendous degree of intensity into the class struggles.

If the processes of fascization are distinguished by their peculiarity in the various capitalist countries, there is no doubt that the variety of the economic, social and national structure, the historic development, even the historic traditions of various capitalist countries, put their imprint on the fascist movement and the fascist dictatorship in various countries.

We will not speak of the difference in the national and social demagogy of the fascist movements in the various countries. It is obvious that in this respect, also, there are certain common features in the national and social demagogy of the fascists—their slogans against Marxism, against Bolshevism, against class struggle, for the community of national interests, against the old bourgeois parties, against parliamentarism, etc. But even in the sphere of social demagogy the fascists have to use varying demagogic slogans, although it may be that in this respect it would not be difficult to establish certain common features, namely the fact that they put their stake on the belief of the petty bourgeoisie in the revival and consolidation of petty-bourgeois ownership, on property-owning instincts in general. Certain doses of anti-capitalist demagogy are used by fascism everywhere, although the fake anti-capitalist slogans and still more the fake socialist slogans are advanced with certain misgivings and with great caution by the fascists after the experience of Germany. In any case, the fascist groups in France talk more about the preservation of savings, the struggle against swindling and bribery, the reduction of taxes, than of the destruction of the "slavery of interest", of "bridling the trusts", etc. In a country where the rentiers and the petty bourgeoisie still form considerable strata, it is more difficult to come out against the "slavery of interest" than in Germany, where post-war inflation had utterly mowed down the rentier strata.

In Austria the clerical fascists also prefer not to use the anti-capitalist slogans or else to make moderate use of them. But the clerical fascists in Austria make great use of religion. Evidently we have to reckon with the fact that in a number of countries the ideology of Austro-fascism, *i.e.*, fascism of the Vatican persuasion, will play a certain role among the masses of Catholics. Evidently the papal encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* will play its role, and not in Austria alone.

In Japan, in the camp of fascism itself, a certain struggle is taking place over the question of what dose of social demagogy is to be used. Some fascist groups willingly bring forward extreme social demagogy against the companies and trusts, but other fascist groups, or rather the fascist leaders, prefer to get on with only the slogan of Japanism, without a strong dose of social demagogy. And after the fascist conspirative societies had taken seriously the struggle against the companies and killed a few big capitalists, the military fascist leaders have become still more cautious in respect to the struggle against the trusts. Of course, any fascist movement looks on its own nation and country as a nation and country of a high or the highest type, and the imperialist claims of its bourgeoisie as the highest expression of international justice. But it is precisely in the sphere of national demagogy that the fascist movement usually bases itself on historic traditions and historic precedents, developing its demagogy on this basis. German fascism has no objection to beginning its descent from Widukind, who fought against Charles the Great, or even from Frederick the Great. Mussolini willingly recalls the greatness of ancient Rome.

However, in speaking of the peculiarities of fascism in the various countries, we have in view not only the peculiarities and the variety of the methods of fascist demagogy. There is no doubt that there are certain differences in the forms of the fascist dictatorship in various countries, and in accordance with the class composition of the leaders. It is clear to us that fascism is the open terroristic dictatorship of the most reactionary, the most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital. This is the class essence of fascism. Nevertheless, in various countries, although the fundamental class essence of the fascist dictatorship is not changed by this, the landlord has a certain influence and a certain weight in determining the policy of the fascist dictatorship. In Italy, the owners of the big landed estates in the South, in Germany the big Junkers of Eastern Prussia, in Japan the semi-feudal landlords, in Hungary the big landlords, have without doubt attached themselves to the fascist movement and in many cases have a very palpable influence on the policy of the fascist dictatorship.

In these countries finance capital in one form or another, to one degree or another, penetrates into agriculture. Some of the landlords take part in the banks, own shares in industrial enterprises. The big landlords to some degree are also participators in the fascist dictatorship. It is clear that the agrarian policy of fascism in these countries first of all takes account of the interests of the landlords, although the

kulak also comes forward here as the bearer of fascism in the village.

In other countries where the landlord does not play such a big role in agriculture as, for example, in Bulgaria, Finland and Latvia, the fascist dictatorship orientates itself in its agrarian policy to a greater degree towards the interests of the kulak as the agency carrying the fascist influence into the villages. The fascist dictatorship is and remains the terrorist dictatorship of the big monopolist bourgeoisie, but according to the economic and social structure of the country, the landlord joins the system of the fascist dictatorship in some form and to some extent.

Finance capital is penetrating more and more into agriculture, subordinating the latter to itself, while the upper ranks of the landlords are becoming fused more and more with various groups of finance capital. The class essence of the fascist dictatorship—the open terroristic dictatorship of big monopolist capital, of its most reactionary, chauvinistic, and imperialist groups—remains unchanged, but there are peculiarities and distinctions not only in the national and social demagogy but also in a certain sense in the methods of rule. But these distinctions should be pointed out in particular because some comrades occasionally consider it below their dignity to analyze fascist ideology at all, or to carry out a struggle against the social and national demagogy of the fascists.

Of course it is difficult to descend to the ideological level of fascist demagogy. Of course, it is repulsive even to refute a person like Rosenberg, who glorifies village idiotism to the level of the culture of the cities, and a person like Hitler who tries to prove that the only calling for women is to have children, that Jews are not human, etc. But we must get over our disgust and analyze the arguments of the fascists.

Fascists are fascists in all countries, but they have different shirts and use different methods for applying the open terrorist dictatorship of finance capital.

These distinctions are expressed, among other things, also in the degree of the liquidation of the organs of bourgeois democracy, parliamentarism and the old bourgeois parties and their mass organizations. The military fascist dictatorship in Bulgaria did away with bourgeois parliamentarism and all the bourgeois parties. In Yugoslavia the military fascist dictatorship suppressed all the old bourgeois parties and for long years did not even attempt to form a new political party in their place. The German and Italian fascists even give their fascist dictatorship the name of a total dictatorship. The "totality" of the fascist dictatorship is expressed in the fact that in these countries the monopoly of the political power and legal political activity is concentrated in the hands of the ruling fascist party alone. It is clear that there is a considerable difference between the fascist dictatorship in Italy and the dictatorship of the National Socialists in Germany. For example, in respect to the trade union question the Italian fascists adopted methods which differed considerably from the methods of the German National Socialists. The fact of the matter is that in Germany and Italy the institutions of bourgeois democracy have been most fully and consistently destroyed and the political monopoly of the ruling fascist party has been fully brought about. This striving towards political monopoly is a tendency of the fascist dictatorship in general. In Italy and Germany, fascism squeezed out and suppressed all the old bourgeois parties, mass organizations, squeezed out and destroyed social-democracy and the reformist trade unions.

In a number of other fascist countries a certain limited place is maintained for the old bourgeois parties, for their mass organizations. For example in Poland, Hungary and Finland a certain screen of parliamentarism is kept up, and the old bourgeois parties and mass organizations are given a certain role. In Yugoslavia and Bulgaria we have seen the advance of the military fascist cliques. This form of bourgeois dictatorship is utilized in those countries where fascism as a mass movement has not had time to win for itself a sufficiently wide mass basis to carry out the open terrorist dictatorship of the big bourgeoisie. In Japan the backbone of the fascist movement is the officers' corps, although in Japan the military fascist movement is the very one which has a mass basis and mass influence.

In the struggle against the fascist dictatorship, all these distinctions have, of course, a certain significance in the sense of exposing the ideology of fascism. But the degree of the liquidation of the organs of bourgeois democracy, the degree of the suppression of the old bourgeois parties, is of no small importance also from the point of view of the internal struggle, the conflicts in the camp of fascism itself. Fascism tries to overcome and crush these disputes and conflicts. Sometimes it is successful for a short time, but later, in the long run, the conflicts and disputes, the clashes in the camp of the fascist bourgeoisie, break out more rapidly and strongly.

Connected with this question, the question of the degree to which the institutions of bourgeois democracy had been abolished and the old bourgeois parties done away with, is the question of the utilization of the contradictions in the camp of fascism by the proletariat and their party.

Up to June 30 the Trotzkyite wing of social-fascism completely denied the possibility of utilizing the conflicts in the camp of the bourgeoisie, and, in *Unser Wort*, accused the Communists of overestimating these conflicts. Social-democracy puts its stake mainly on the conflicts and dissensions in the camp of the bourgeoisie.

It cannot be questioned that the events of June

30 in Germany and July 25 in Austria, the series of attacks and assassinations in Japan, the murder of the Minister of the Interior, Peratski, in Poland, showed again and again that fascism cannot liquidate, crush and suppress the conflicts in the camp of the fascist bourgeoisie, the conflicts which arise from the contradiction in the interests and the position of the bourgeoisie themselves.

The arrest and deportation of the former Assistant State Secretary for Home Affairs, Arpinati and Co., in Italy, showed that Italian fascism has also had its own June 30, although in quieter and less catastrophic forms. In Finland, the Lapuas clique organized an armed attack on the fascist dictatorship. On the contrary, in the long run, fascism will intensify and strengthen these conflicts, which, precisely in the conditions of the fascist dictatorship, take the form of mutual murders, attacks, shootings, frequently reaching the point of civil war in the camp of fascism itself. Fascism has to create a strongly welded authoritative State power. But the history of the fascist dictatorships in Germany, Austria, Finland and Bulgaria, shows that the fascist dictatorship leads to armed conflicts in the camp of fascism. These events have demonstrated and proved that the dissension, the conflicts, the mutual killings, shootings and armed conflicts in the camp of the fascist bourgeoisie which shake and shatter the fascist dictatorship, can only be used if the proletariat is able to convert the mass discontent with the fascist dictatorship into mass activity, if mass activity bursts into the opening fissures in the edifice of the fascist dictatorship and really blows it asunder.

If this is not the case, the conflicts and the dissensions in the camp of the fascists will take place behind the back of the proletariat. There is no unity in the fascist camp, but the proletariat can utilize the conflicts there if it is able to come out as an independent class force under the leadership of its Party. The significance of the conflicts in the camp of the fascists can only be denied by people who believe that fascism is capable of creating organized capitalism and an organized bourgeoisie.

The salvation of the proletariat from the fascist dictatorship as the result of conflicts in the camp of the bourgeoisie could only be expected by social-democrats like the Prague party leaders who hope that the Reichswehr generals wil abandon Hitler and invite the social-democrats back again. It is quite possible that the generals will drive out Hitler and even invite individual social-democrats back again, but this will only be the replacement of one form of fascism by another. The Austrian social-democrats also hope that Schuschnig will invite them to Vienna against Staremberg and Fey. But the struggle btween Schuschnig and Staremberg by itself, without mass activity, will not lead to the end of fascism. The crisis of the leadership is one of the prerequisites for the armed revolt of the proletariat. But the crisis of the leaders alone is not yet a sufficient prerequisite for an armed insurrection.

A certain difference exists between the fascist dictatorships in various countries in respect to the degree in which the role of social-democracy is restricted, the degree in which the role of the reformist trade unions is limited or abolished. At the present time in six countries with a fascist dictatorship, social-democratic parties have already been made illegal. This illegality is various in form in the different countries. But the fact is that social-democracy at the present time is an illegal party in Italy, Germany, Austria, Latvia, Bulgaria and Yugoslavia. Of course, there is a big difference between the illegality of the Social-Democratic Party and the illegality of the Communist Party, between the persecution of the social-democratic parties and the terror which is used towards the Communist Parties even in these countries. But the fact remains a fact that in these countries social-democracy has also been driven underground and deprived of the possibility of legal existence. On the other hand, in Poland, Hungary, and as yet in Finland, the social-democratic parties and the reformist trade unions have to a certain degree maintained their place under the fascist sun and the reformist trade unions enjoy a definite legality. Of course, the situation and the place of social-democracy and the reformist unions change in these countries as well. In Finland the role of social-democracy is evidently due to be cut down. In Poland the followers of Pilsudski are going to "unify" the trade unions. In Hungary there is to be a kind of "absorption by the State" of the trade unions.

It is extremely clear that from the point of view of the tactics of the Communist vanguard, these distinctions in the method by which the fascist dictatorship is carried out in the various countries are of great importance. Will fascism form its mass organizations, especially organizations to bring in the workers, will it leave the reformist trade unions in existence, to what extent will it cut down the role of social-democracy—all these questions have a definite tactical significance.

From the point of view of principles, from the point of view of the historic outlook, of course, these distinctions are of no significance. But from the point of view of the present-day struggle Communists are bound to take account of these peculiarities, these distinguishing features of the fascist dictatorship in each separate country.

If we take the fascist dictatorship in various countries it cannot be looked on as something unchangeable. The fascist dictatorship itself is subject to various changes. In various countries the fascist

dictatorship itself undergoes certain alterations. In Italy, Mussolini has reorganized his party three times according to the requirements of the policy of the monopolist bourgeoisie.

In Germany from February, 1933, to the declaration of the end of the national revolution by Hitler in June, 1933, and further right up to the shooting of the Storm Troop leaders on June 30, 1934, changes took place in the fascist dictatorship which adopted extremely dramatic and catastrophic forms. In Poland, during the rule of Pilsudski's dictatorship, there was a certain kind of shifting of the mass basis from Pilsudski's followers to the N.D. Party and to their national radical wing, *i.e.*, the wing which is most fascist of all. The basic and decisive groups of the big bourgeoisie are rallying around Pilsudski, while considerable strata of the petty bourgeoisie are deserting Pilsudski. In Yugoslavia the fascist power was established in the form of a military fascist dictatorship. Later the military fascist dictatorship tried to form a petty-bourgeois mass basis for itself. In Bulgaria, fascism also came to power at first on the whole as a military fascist dictatorship, and later concealed itself behind certain parliamentary decorations, afterwards returning to the most naked form of military fascist dictatorship. Trotzkyism denies the fascist character of the dictatorships in these countries, describing as Bonapartism the power of Pilsudski, Georgiev and, in his time, Schleicher. But the whole point is that these dictatorships have nothing in common with Bonapartism in the Marxist sense of this term. There is no equilibrium between classes, the army does not rest on the peasants, the government apparatus has not acquired a certain independence.

In this respect, is it possible to discover some common tendency, some common law, in the development of the fascist dictatorship in the various countries? Such a common tendency, such a common law, exists. It is of political and tactical significance from the point of view of the Communist vanguard. On the path to power, fascism appeals to the petty bourgeoisie in town and village, and also tries to penetrate into the working class, to mobilize the lumpen-proletariat, in short, to form a mass basis for the dictatorship of the big monopolist bourgeoisie. On coming to power and carrying on the policy of the big monopolist bourgeoisie, the fascist dictatorship discloses the contradictions between its petty-bourgeois mass basis and the policy of the big bourgeoisie.

This contradiction between words and deeds is much more outstanding with the fascists than with any other bourgeois party. The development of the fascist dictatorship in various countries consists precisely of the fact that, among other things, fascism has shown itself ever more openly and plainly as the dictatorship of the most reactionary, the most chauvinist and imperialist elements of the monopolist bourgeoisie, and has ever more openly abandoned its demagogic promises and cries, has ever more lost its petty-bourgeois mass basis. Fascism cannot give up its petty-bourgeois mass basis. But this basis is ever more splitting away from it. Naturally, the desertion of fascism by the petty-bourgeois masses must not under any circumstances be understood in too simplified a manner. This desertion takes place through tremendous vacillations, through the differentiation of the petty-bourgeois masses. In Germany some of the petty-bourgeois supporters of national socialism who left it were seized by the monarchists, others by the Catholics. There is no doubt that some of the storm troops, some of the toiling petty-bourgeois elements favor the proletariat, are feeling out the path towards the proletariat, not to mention the workers who formerly and even now are in the storm detachments or in the national socialist factory organizations.

In Poland the petty-bourgeois and peasant masses who left Pilsudski were partly seized on by the N.D.'s and N.R.'s, while the peasant masses fell under the influence of various fascist groups of Narodniki; to some extent certain strata of the peasants and the intelligentsia have begun to seek the path towards the proletariat. In Austria, part of the petty bourgeoisie, according to the conditions, waver between Austro-fascism and national socialism. But this does not mean that differentiation is not taking place even now among the petty-bourgeois masses in the direction of the proletariat. Of course, in the process of these vacillations which may continue for quite a long time, the toiling elements of the petty bourgeoisie will abandon the camp of fascism and find their way into the camp of the proletariat.

But it is an extremely complex process to break the petty-bourgeois masses away from fascism, to neutralize them, to win over their toiling strata to the side of the proletariat, and this process can only be accelerated in proportion as the proletariat show themselves to these masses as a force able to deliver a blow at the big bourgeoisie, a force able to storm the fortress of the bourgeoisie. Theories and hypotheses that the petty bourgeoisie as a whole will forever be on the side of the black hundreds, the nationalists, the Bonapartists, the fascists, are foolish and Trotzkyite. But we cannot simplify the task of the winning of the petty-bourgeois masses by the proletariat.

In any case, one of the laws of development of the fascist dictatorship is that the fascist dictatorship exposes itself as the dictatorship of the big monopolist bourgeoisie and loses its petty-bourgeois mass basis. But at the same time the fascist dictatorship tries to replace the loss of the petty-bourgeois mass

basis by strengthening the fascist State machine, by increasing the pressure of the fascist State machine, by strengthening fascist license and terror. Of course, this narrowing down of the petty-bourgeois mass basis, this sharpening of the conflicts in the camp of the bourgeoisie, this increasing resistance of the proletariat, may cause the fascist dictatorship to some extent and in some form to widen the role of social-democracy and particularly of the reformist leaders in the system of its dictatorship, insofar as this role was cut down, and to draw various groups of the social-democratic leaders or various groups of the reformist leaders into the system of the fascist dictatorship. At the present time, in particular, rumors are spreading that negotiations will take place between the social-democrats and the fascists on the question of the formation of "neutral" trade unions in Germany and Austria. There is also talk about the attraction of social-democracy in Italy.

We do not wish to say that this will be the general tendency, the general law of the fascist dictatorships. However, it is necesary to reckon with this possibility, that even in the countries where social-democracy is at present underground, it may be admitted to legal existence by the fascists themselves. The general tendency, the general law of the fascist dictatorship is that the fascist parties are more and more being converted into a central bureaucratic apparatus of the bourgeois State, split away from the petty-bourgeois masses with the help of which fascism came to power. To the extent that fascism, when in power, carries on the policy of the most influential groups of the monopolist bourgeoisie, it must lose its mass character as a party and become a part of the bureaucratic apparatus.

But it would be exrtemely dangerous to underestimate the fact that fascism, relying on its monopolist political power, will still further strengthen the State machine and the apparatus of violence of the bourgeois State. The apparatus of violence and suppression must not be regarded in the narrow sense of terror, physical violence and suppression. Fascism widens and increases the apparatus for moral pressure by the bourgeois States, crushing all the forms and possibilities for legal workers' education, corrupting the minds of the working youth, using the monopoly of the press, the schools, the stage, radio, the cinema, etc., to dope the toiling masses. This apparatus of mental and physical violence cannot, of course, take the place of the real support of the masses but will create new and painful difficulties for the class struggle of the proletariat, additional tremendous new difficulties for the Communist vanguard in the struggle for the overthrow of the fascist dictatorship, the overthrow of capitalism in general, though the events of the last few months have clearly and undoubtedly shown that fascism not only hinders but also hastens the revolutionary crisis.

THE BASIC MATERIALS FOR THE DISCUSSION FOR THE SEVENTH WORLD CONGRESS

•

THESES, REPORTS, SPEECHES OF THE THIRTEENTH PLENUM OF THE E.C.C.I.

Now at Reduced Prices

•

Theses and Decisions ..... .05
Fascism, the Danger of War, and the Tasks of the Communist Parties —*Report by O. Kuusinen* ..... .10
We Are Fighting for a Soviet Germany—*Report by Wilhelm Pieck* ..... .10
The Communist Parties in the Fight for the Masses—*Speech by O. Piatnitsky* ..... .10
Fascism, Social-Democracy, and the Communists—*Speech by V. Knorin* ..... .10
Revolutionary Crisis, Fascism and War—*Speech by D. Z. Manuilsky* ..... .05
Revolutionary China Today—*Speeches by Wan Ming and Kang Sin* ..... .10
Revolutionary Struggle of the Toiling Masses of Japan—*Speech by Okano* ..... .05

•

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 East 13th Street) New York City

THE PROPOSALS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY FOR UNITED FRONT WITH THE S. P. IN THE U. S. A.

By SAM BROWN

AT THE National Convention of the American Socialist Party held last June, a new "Left" leadership came into office. This new leadership professed, in vague terms, to be in favor of united front actions with the Communist Party. In this, the new S.P. leadership reflected the tremendous pressure exerted upon them by the rank and file of the Socialist Party. Large sections of the rank and file of the S.P. have been in favor of united front actions and have been participating, despite the official leadership of the Party, in many united front actions with the Communist Party.

The Communist Party addressed to the S.P. Convention a letter with the proposal for united front actions. The "Left" leadership which dominated the Convention refused to act on the united front proposals of the Communist Party. However, it did not dare, in view of the sentiments of the rank-and-file delegates, to reject openly the united front letter of the Communist Party. The Convention decided to refer the united front letter to the newly elected National Committee for final action.

Following the Socialist Party Convention, the Central Committee of the Communist Party addressed another letter to the newly elected National Committee of the Socialist Party. The united front proposals were made in the midst of the huge strike wave, in the midst of the movement for local general strikes and when the great heroism of the stubbornly battling American working class was met by the bayonet charges and machine-gun fire of the National Guard. In this letter the C.P. called attention to the fact that *some of the leaders of the S.P., now on its Executive Committee, have on many occasions expressed a readiness to enter into united front negotiations.* The united front proposals of the Party were as follows:

1. Decisive wage increases and reduction in hours, supporting a bold strike movement to win them; 2. For the immediate enactment of the Workers' Unemployment Insurance Bill; 3. For the immediate enactment of the Farmers' Emergency Relief Bill to secure for the farmers the possession of their lands and tools, and to provide abundance of food to the masses; 4. For the immediate enactment of the Bill for Negro Rights; 5. For the united struggle against war and fascism; 6. For the broadest possible united action in localities, in factories, in trade unions, and on every question affecting the workers and toiling masses, to win better conditions.

The new "Left" National Committee of the Socialist Party met the C.P.'s official letter proposing united front actions with complete silence. The C.P. in the month of July sent a second letter. The Socialist Party did not answer the second letter of the C.P. either. The silence of the S.P. leaders was in reality only a confirmation of the growing urge for unity expressed by the rank and file of the Socialist Party.

The C.P. did not confine itself with its united front appeals to the National Committee of the Socialist Party. The C.P. addressed its appeals also directly to the various locals of the Socialist Party. The *Daily Worker* has developed an energetic united front campaign addressed to the membership of the Socialist Party. In this campaign the *Daily Worker* also popularized the experience of the united front activities in France and Austria, which exerted an influence on the united front within the Socialist Party.

The energetic activities of some of the District organizations in appealing directly to the Socialist Party locals broke the ice. A number of the S.P. locals endorsed the Unemployment Insurance Bill sponsored by the Party and participated in united front actions in the various unemployed struggles and in the preparations for the Congress Against War and Fascism. The present strike wave has emphasized the growing urge towards unity and class solidarity on the part of the American working class. The growing fascist-like terror drive in the strike wave has deepened amongst the Socialist rank and file the desire for immediate united front actions against the growth of fascism and for the defense of the civil rights of the workers. The splendid leadership of the Party in the general strike movement in San Francisco, the effectiveness of united front actions as demonstrated by the heroic strike of the San Francisco longshoremen, have raised the standing of the Party as the leader of the united front movement.

The movement in the Socialist Party locals for united front actions has finally compelled Norman Thomas, the new "Left" leader of the S.P., to make some vague statements in favor of the united front.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party took up the remarks of Norman Thomas, and on August 17 Comrade Browder, the general Secretary of the C.P., sent a letter addressed to Norman Thomas proposing immediate discussion on the C.P.'s united front proposal. In answering Comrade Browder's letter, Norman Thomas gave an evasive reply in which he advanced the usual arguments about the "lack of sincerity and good faith". Thomas, without completely shutting the door for further discussion, wrote in his letter to Comrade Browder as follows:

"... I expect to take up the entire matter [united front proposals] at the meeting of the N.E.C. of the Socialist Party over Labor Day. My own personal feeling is, as I have said many times before, that enormously desirable as united action is *against* war and fascism and *for* certain specific measures between your Party and ours, it cannot be achieved if your Party still regards it as primarily a weapon to destroy the Socialist Party or for leadership. The basis for a united front is good faith. This does not mean that each Party may not reserve its right to criticize the other and to appeal for support for itself. It does mean that we have to keep to fair play in the way in which we fight and especially in the field in which we are cooperating."

Comrade Browder, in his answer to Thomas' letter proposing direct conversations, wrote as follows:

"... You state the chief obstacle is the opinion of many Socialist Party leaders that the Communist Party regards united action 'as primarily a weapon to destroy the Socialist Party'. This opinion is incorrect. The Communist Party regards united action as primarily a weapon to protect the immediate needs of the workers and other toiling elements of the population, to defeat the attacks of the capitalists upon their living standards and civil rights, and to prepare the masses through their experiences for the struggle in the tasks involved in moving forward to greater aims. ... The essence of the problem of good faith and fair play can be found in determining concretely what is necessary to carry out fully a particular action. This in turn is determined by an agreed-upon set of demands, such as we have proposed recently, but subject to mutual determination) and methods of carrying out joint actions in very concrete terms. The Communist Party is prepared for the effort to arrive at such an agreement. The Communist Party is prepared to demonstrate its good faith in any agreement for united action by the only method through which good faith can be demonstrated, by carrying through the agreed upon action with all of its energy. ... The Communist Party is prepared, upon the basis of agreed-upon actions, to conclude an agreement for restraining and establishing limitations upon mutual criticism between the cooperating organizations during the course of the action. ..."

At the meeting of the National Committee of the Socialist Party held in the first week of September, a committee headed by Comrade Robert Minor appeared to make the united front proposals of the C.P. The National Committee meeting of the Socialist Party rejected the proposal for immediate united front actions. However, in view of the united front movement within its local organizations, the S.P. leadership did not bluntly, as in the past, reject the C.P. united front proposals outright. The National Executive Committee of the S.P. officially declared that it "has postponed united front negotiations on the basis of the invitation from the Communist Party till the next meeting of the N.E.C.". The answer of the Socialist N.E.C. to the Central Committee of the C.P. is a diplomatic statement calculated to discredit the idea of the united front and at the same time head off a strong opposition movement within the S.P. against the attitude of the S.P. leadership on the united front proposals of the C.P. In that statement the S.P. leadership declared that it,

"... realizes the immense value to the labor movement of a united action of all elements against the danger of war, fascism and continued exploitation. We realize that such united action on specific issues by no means requires organic unity of Parties between the Socialists and Communists. United action does require evidence of good faith and the intention to use any agreement which may be arrived at, not as a maneuver for power within the labor movement but as an instrument in the struggle against an oppressive master class."

Further the letter states its objection to the term and charges of social-fascism, and that

"... the ultimate success of a united action movement will best be served if we postpone consideration of further negotiations between our two parties until our next meeting about Dec. 1, by which time we shall have had opportunities to observe the decisions of the Communist International Congress and the success or failure of the French agreement. We shall also have had time to get the advice of the Labor and Socialist International to which we are writing, urging that body again to renew its attempt to find an honorable basis for a reasonable agreement."

Least of all could this statement of the Socialist Party afford to make an open and direct rejection regarding local united front actions. The S.P. statement winds up with the declaration that:

"Meanwhile we are aware that there are questions arising from time to time, mostly in the field of civil liberties, in which it is desirable that there shall be effective local action for the defense of workers' rights. We are therefore drawing up a plan to govern possible cooperation in this field. The success or failure of this kind of cooperation will do much to determine the nature of the action which we shall take at our next quarterly meeting."

Why does the S.P. leadership declare that "it is desirable that there shall be effective *local* [united front] action"? In the past, even those in the S.P. leadership who made statements in favor of the

united front warned the local organizations not to enter into any united front actions with the C.P. without the prmission of the N.E.C. In the past the S.P. leadership issued strict prohibitive orders threatening disciplinary measures against those locals that will participate in united front actions with the C.P. This time the National Committee feared that an open prohibition of local united front actions would only increase the opposition of the rank and file towards its leadership and therefore it offers its "co-operation" so that it might check, limit and control the movement in the localities for the united front. Yes, indeed, the whole secret of the "subtle", diplomatic answer and refusal of the S.P. leadership to the united front lies in the response of the locals of the S.P., to the united front appeals of the C.P.

It is the united front actions of the locals of the S.P. in response to the C.P. united front proposals that will determine the final promised answer of the Socialist Party leadership to the persistent united front proposals of the Central Committee of the C.P.

LITTLE LENIN LIBRARY

Some of the shorter writings of Lenin, published in uniform format at popular prices.

1. THE TEACHINGS OF KARL MARX ..... .15
2. THE WAR AND THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL ..... .20
3. SOCIALISM AND WAR ..... .15
4. WHAT IS TO BE DONE? ..... .50
5. THE PARIS COMMUNE ..... .20
6. THE REVOLUTION OF 1905 ..... .20
7. RELIGION ..... .15
8. LETTERS FROM AFAR ..... .15
9. THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT IN OUR REVOLUTION ..... .15
10. THE APRIL CONFERENCE ..... .20
11. THE THREATENING CATASTROPHE AND HOW TO FIGHT IT ..... .20
12. WILL THE BOLSHEVIKS RETAIN STATE POWER? ..... .15
13. ON THE EVE OF OCTOBER ..... .15
14. STATE AND REVOLUTION ..... .30
15. IMPERIALISM, THE HIGHEST STAGE OF CAPITALISM ..... .30
16. LENIN — *Joseph Stalin* ..... .10
17. A LETTER TO AMERICAN WORKERS ..... .05
18. FOUNDATIONS OF LENINISM — *Joseph Stalin* ..... .40
19. PROBLEMS OF LENINISM—*Joseph Stalin* ..... .25
20. "LEFT-WING" COMMUNISM: AN INFANTILE DISORDER ..... .25
21. THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND RENEGADE KAUTSKY ..... .30

Order from
WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS
P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 East 13th Street) New York City

THE LATEST MANEUVERS OF THE FRENCH TROTZKYITES

By A. BOREAU

THE small but noisy group of French Trotzkyites who until now paraded under the demagogic banner of the "Communist League of Bolshevik-Leninists" on the initiative and the insistence of Trotzky, decided that the entire organization with all its Trotzkyite baggage join the French section of the Second International. This decision, along with the increased "activity" of the Trotzkyites among the social-democratic workers in a number of other countries, throws a strong light on the new tasks which now fall on Trotzky, the reliable agent of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, under the conditions of a new and deep turn in the working class movement.

The bourgeoisie is immeasurably increasing its attacks on the standards of living of the toiling masses. It is feverishly preparing for the fascist dictatorship in the countries where we still have, more or less, bourgeois democracy. New big class clashes are approaching. The development of a new world war and especially a counter-revolutionary war against the Soviet Union, has become a real question of the entire international policy.

Under such conditions the bourgeoisie, more than ever before, requires a split in the working class, disorientation and disintegration among the wide toiling masses. The Second International until very recently has very often been able to hold back the decisive majority of the proletariat in various countries from revolutionary struggle. It is now, after the bankruptcy of the German and Austrian social-democracies, living through a deep crisis. Large sections of the toiling masses who until now were under their influence, demand a joint struggle against the bourgeoisie, against fascism and war.

In a number of countries the leaders of the social-democracy have already shown themselves to be incapable of hindering the realization of the united front struggles between the social-democratic and Communist organizations. In spite of all the efforts of the old "experienced" leaders of social-democracy, such as Vandervelde, to convince their supporters that "the Communists are only the rabble", the rapidly expanding Left group of the social-democratic workers strive towards unity with the Communists; are already approaching the position of Communism, though slowly and still waveringly. The further development of this process of the turn towards the Left by the social-democratic workers is a threat to the bourgeoisie and unites the actions of the working class on the revolutionary platform of the Communists. In order to hinder this, the bourgeoisie throws its Trotzky reserves (which are now being organized in the Second International) in order to fill in this breach. It sends the counter-revolutionary renegades, who hide their face behind the mask of "Bolshevik-Leninists", to the assistance of the old reformists who have lost all their credit with the working class masses, so that they, by their sham revolutionary noise, can divert the influence of the Left social-democratic workers from real revolutionary struggles. This, at the present time, is the main task which has been given by the bourgeoisie to their Trotzkyite agents.

It is not accidental that every new turn of the social-democratic working class masses to the Left is accompanied by new attempts of the Trotzkyites to become active. Trotzky invented the Fourth International when Hitler came into power in order, by this poisonous slogan, to divert the indignation of the social-democratic workers against the policy of the Second International and to hinder their turning to Communism. After the February fights in France, that still further undermined the social-democratic illusions in the ranks of the socialist workers in "democratic" countries, a raid on Trotzky's Boabiance bungalow was staged in accordance with all the rules of police technique, in order to create the story of his "persecution", and in order to concentrate the attention of the masses who are turning to the Left, on this. All this, though, was of very little avail. The "Fourth International", however, exists only in endless Trotzkyite resolutions.

The "campaign against Trotzky's persecutions" was halted and the Doumergue-Tardieu government extended its hospitality and offered a cozy place to Trotzky. Meanwhile, the agreement for a united front between the Communist and Socialist Parties in France could be realized because of the struggles led by the Communist Party against fascism and the emergency decrees. The masses turning to the Left, under the correct policy of the Communist Party, discover new ways of quickening the coming together of the social-democratic workers on the basis of a revolutionary position. Trotzky is starting his new campaign in order to save the situation for the bourgeoisie.

His supporters join social-democracy, the Second International, in order to disorientate and disintegrate from within the Left group of the social-democratic workers, in order more easily to infect their ranks with anti-Soviet and anti-Communist slander. Trotzky and the Trotzkyites themselves acknowledge that their basic mission in the ranks of social-democracy

remains the struggle against Communism. "If the Communists try to disorganize the Socialist Party"—writes the *Secrete,* and as stated eloquently in the *Voix Communiste,* No. 38, "then only our ideas and our methods may inject a revolutionary kernel into the Socialist Party, enabling it to resist complete crash".

It is quite clear. These gentlemen dream of creating an anti-Communist kernel in the Socialist Party, of course, under a "Left" banner in order to resist the penetration of "dangerous ideas" into the mass of social-democratic workers. Trotzkyism openly acknowledges its desire to play the role of the last barrier within social-democracy in order to hinder the broad wave of the Left stream from coming close to the Communist position.

The Trotzkyites state that they are returning to the Socialist Party in order to have the possibility of "participating" in the united front realized between the Communist and Socialist Parties in France. But what is this "participation" of the Trotzkyites in the united front?

At the time when the Socialist and Communist workers defend and develop the united front with all their strength as the most important prerequisite for their victory over the forces of the fascist dictatorship, the Trotzkyites are busy spreading their sabotaging slander that the united front is nothing else but a "bloc between new bureaucracies" and that joint action is only a "boresome parade". At the moment when Doumergue, in the name of "defending the franc", warned the "good Frenchmen" against the united front, as this was being the biggest hindrance in realizing his fascist "State reform", the Trotzkyites attack the united front "from the Left" in the name of "revolutionary principles", shamelessly stating that "the slogan and methods of the united front express capitulation before the Bonapartist State. [this means, according to the Trotzkyite terminology, before the Government of Doumergue!—A.B.] which clears the path to fascism". (*Verite,* No. 220, September, 1934.) The sabotaging Trotzkyite "criticism" of the united front is an organic part of the wide, well-planned drive of the French bourgeoisie and its fascist detachments against the united action of the French proletariat.

But the Trotzkyites' "participation" in the united front has as yet another side. At the time when the masses of the Socialist workers consciously acknowledge the U.S.S.R. as their socialist fatherland and widen the united front in the defense of the Soviet Union, the Trotzky renegades try to break the united front by their provocatory anti-Soviet slander. They direct the edge of their speeches whenever they manage to get to the joint meetings of the Socialist and Communist Parties, not against the bourgeoisie, not against fascism but against the Soviet Union and its policy of peace. By spreading slander that the Soviet Union represents not the dictatorship of the proletariat but "absolutism, Thermidorian bureaucracy", and that its foreign policy is not the policy of peace in the interests of the international proletariat, but a "nationalist diplomacy", Trotzky supplies all the enemies of the united front with anti-Soviet "arguments". His counter-revolutionary "ideas" arm also Vandervelde, who motivates his aversion to the proletarian unity of action by the "absence of democracy" and the "persecution of revolutionaries" in the U.S.S.R. The renegade Doriot, hiding his splitting plots, attacked the "twists of Soviet diplomacy" as though this is the main obstacle in the unity of the working class. The Trotzkyites join the Socialist Party precisely in order to have a greater possibility of assisting Vandervelde, Doriot and the other enemies of the united front, to paralyze the will of the social-democratic workers towards united action, by their anti-Soviet and anti-Communist slander, in order to help the bourgeoisie divert the Socialist Party from a united front with the Communists.

The fact of the French Trotzkyites returning to the bosom of the Second International and their own particular "theory" with which Trotzky defends his crime, throw a strong light on the real essence of the Trotzkyites' attempts to "create a new revolutionary party of the Fourth International". According to Trotzky's latest theory, the Communist Party exists no longer, there are "only two centrist formations of different origin in the working class movement and preference has to be given to social-democracy as the one more 'live' and 'dynamic'" (*Verite,* No. 220). It is clear that Trotzky by openly and zealously singing the praises of the "broad democracy" supposed to exist in the parties of the Second International, strives to hold back the social-democratic workers from leaving the position of the Second International, to keep them from approaching Communism.

Trotzky goes still further. Under the cover of preaching "progressiveness", "uniting two parties and the two Internationals", he in fact proposes to liquidate the Communist International and the Communist Party of France, and return to the conditions existing in the working class movement in 1914.

> "We Marxists," explains the authoritative writer in *Voix Communiste,* No. 235, "must acknowledge that at the given moment the merging of the two parties would be progressive not in comparison with Lenin's slogans of 1914, not in comparison with the Tours Congress but in comparison with the present situation. As such, the merging of both parties would signify the possibility of beginning anew. This is the essence of the entire question.
>
> "The working class movement has been driven

into an historical impasse . . . and this beginning of the impasse, this 'capitulation' is turned into a progressive factor!"

We have to be just to the Trotzkyites. This formulation of the "progressiveness of capitulation" expresses with remarkable brevity the essence of the entire Trotzkyite "science". The social-democratic workers who are turning to the Left, who are striving to break forward in the struggle against fascism and capitalist exploitation, are seeking a way out of the impasse of the policy of the Second International in unification with the revolutionary working class organizations on a revolutionary platform. But Trotzky in the name of "progressiveness" demands capitulation of all the revolutionary organizations, that they give up all positions which have been won during the last 20 years by the Leninist, Bolshevik, revolutionary wing of the working class movements of all the countries. The Trotzkyites call the workers back to 1914 in order to "start anew" to taste all the beauties inseparable from the domination of opportunism in the working class movement, the support of imperialist war, class collaboration with the bourgeoisie, eternal splitting of the social-democratic working class—these are the inevitable mates of the unprincipled "unification". The "unity" phrases of Trotzkyism, merging with the sham slogans of Doriot and the other false friends of unity, serve only one purpose—to hinder the consolidation of the Socialist and Communist workers around the revolutionary principles of the class struggle, and to direct the powerful urge of the Socialist workers to revolutionary united action of the working class onto the Communist paths.

Trying to intercept the expanding Left stream within social-democracy, the Trotzkyites act "more 'Left' than the Left", as though ordained to show the way to the social-democratic workers. But in fact they have nothing in common with that which is really Left in the ranks of this Party.

The Trotzkyites and the really Left tendency among the social-democratic workers move in opposite directions. At the time when the Left socialist workers leave the position of the Second International and strive towards revolutionary unity of action with the Communists, the Trotzkyites have returned to social-democracy in order by a defeatist policy to paralyze the militant spirit of the social-democratic workers; to drive a wedge between them and Communism. Trotzkyism remains in the ranks of social-democracy what it was when it came out under the banner of the "Communist opposition" and then the "Fourth International"—agents of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, which is at the present moment preparing new snares for the social-democratic workers, who feel the urge towards revolutionary unity of action of the working class. Trotzkyism is preparing these new maneuvers for the purpose of undermining the fighting capacity of the French proletariat in the face of the approaching fierce class struggles against fascism.

The social-democratic workers are able to continue on their path to the revolutionary position, casting off the counter-revolutionary Trotzkyite renegades. To continue and strengthen the merciless exposure of counter-revolutionary Trotzkyism before the broadest masses of toilers, and particularly before the Left social-democratic workers, is an inseparable part of the struggle of the French Communists for a united anti-fascist front, for the realization of the revolutionary unity of action of the French proletariat.

Stalin Refutes Trotzky's "History" in

THE OCTOBER REVOLUTION

By Joseph Stalin

Both in speeches delivered and articles written in the October days and in the course of the polemical discussions with the Trotzky opposition, Stalin shatters the myths of the Trotzkyist, anti-Bolshevik historians. He appraises the Bolshevik revolution, its main periods and international significance.

Cloth $1.00

Also: PROBLEMS OF LENINISM, *By* Joseph Stalin ..... 25 cents

•

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 East 13th Street) New York City

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST UNEMPLOYMENT AND STARVATION

A Review by J. DAVIS

Shall It Be Hunger Doles or Unemployment Insurance?, by Herbert Benjamin, (price 2 cents).

Constitution and Regulations of the National Unemployment Council, (price 3 cents).

Don't Take It Lying Down, by Pen and Hammer Club (price 2 cents).

The Jobless Negro, by Elizabeth Lawson (price 1 cent).

Our Children Cry for Bread, by Sadie Van Veen (price 1 cent).

Make the Democrats Keep Their Promises (price 2 cents).

Industrial Slavery—Roosevelt's New Deal, by I. Amter (price 1 cent).

Published by the National Committee, Unemployment Councils, Room 437, 80 East 11th Street, New York City.

IN this, the sixth year since the beginning of the world economic crisis, and the second year of the Roosevelt "New Deal" in the U.S.A., there are from 15,000,000 to 16,000,000 totally unemployed workers. (The government claims less than 9,000,000, the A. F. of L. Executive Council a little more than that, but a survey by the Massachusetts Labor Department even admits to 14,000,000, exclusive of those on government public work projects.) Hundreds of thousands of the unemployed still roam the countryside, the roads, the railroad freight trains, still live in ramshackle colonies on waterfronts and in empty lots.

Yet the struggles of the unemployed have lagged behind; in the great upsurge of militant struggle among the employed workers in the recent months, the revolutionary movement has slackened in the work among the unemployed to such an extent that the Unemployment Councils in most of the largest localities have conducted few struggles, especially when compared to the first few years of the crisis. It is disastrous to allow such a condition to continue; the task of leading the unemployed is of greater importance today than ever before, of leading them in the struggle for increase of relief, instead of the cutting of relief which has become the custom in most cities and states; in the struggle against forced labor, and military schemes for the unemployed youth; in the struggle for the homeless unemployed; in the further broadening of the struggle for a living wage on relief works, in which the work of the revolutionary elements has shown great improvement, and in the struggle for the Workers' Unemployment Insurance Bill, which, although not as broad as it should be, is nevertheless the best phase of the unemployed work as far as achievements are concerned. Also a great task is the uniting of the unemployed, now divided into many organizations.

The lapse in the unemployed work in the U.S.A. is especially noticeable when we see the important achievements by the Communist Party and the Unemployment Councils as a result of the many state hunger marches in 1930-1933; the two splendid National Hunger Marches to Washington in 1931 and 1932, and the great unemployed demonstrations in nearly all the large cities from coast to coast. These were the actions which led to the granting of whatever relief has been allowed; which led to the placing of hundreds of thousands in Civil Works jobs in 1933; which led to whatever public works projects have been undertaken.

The solidarity of the unemployed with the striking workers, their refusal to scab and their solidarity on the picket lines; such sharp struggles as have occurred in the recent year or so, the fact that over 65,000 unemployed workers on relief jobs have struck this year (up until September 15), show that the objective conditions for the sharpest struggles yet on the part of the unemployed are present, but it requires increased attention by the revolutionary movement.

Here are seven pamphlets which deal with many different phases of the struggle of the unemployed in the U.S.A. Most of them belong to the "Unemployment Series" issued by the National Committee of the Unemployment Councils. Each of the pamphlets thus far issued in the series has its definite value in the struggles of the unemployed. But just as some of these titles exemplify the most successful aspects of the work of the Unemployment Councils, so also do certain titles for which we look in vain typify those phases of the unemployed work which have been weakest—weaknesses which have been among the main reasons for the fact that the struggles of the unemployed in the U.S.A. have not in the past few years assumed the proportions to be expected of them.

Shall It Be Hunger Doles or Unemployment Insurance? deals with some of the "plans" by which the capitalists, and especially more recently, their new

set of agents, the "New Dealers", have attempted to hoodwink the unemployed into being docile. The Community Chest, under which Hoover's idea that unemployment is strictly a local program was carried out; the "share the work" or Stagger Plan, which rather means for the unemployed and employed workers a "share the starvation" plan; the "self-help" and "barter" schemes, especially favored by the social-demagogues of the Musteite stripe; the Civil Works and the Public Works plans, and the forced labor of the C.C.C. camps are described briefly but with sufficient detail. They are all exposed to the workers for what they are, but in dealing with the Civil Works plan the author fails to point out that, limited as the C.W.A. was, it represented at least a partial victory for the unemployed and came as a result of the struggles led by the Unemployment Councils.

There are telling figures which give in a nutshell the results of the hunger program of American capitalism—the driving down of that handful of unemployed who actually receive some relief to a living standard of little better than $1 a week in many localities, not to mention those millions who get no relief at all.

A most important section of this pamphlet is the one in which the Workers' Unemployment Insurance Bill—originally proposed by the Unemployment Councils, calling for a minimum of $10 weekly for every unemployed worker and $3 weekly for each dependent, for taxation of all incomes above $5,000 a year, to raise the funds; and for administration of the Bill by the workers—is contrasted with such fake unemployment insurance plans as the Wagner-Lewis Bill; the Groves Law of Wisconsin; the Ohio Plan, and a host of others, all of which provide for not one of the basic conditions mentioned in the Workers' Bill, but instead so restrict the categories of workers eligible to receive insurance, and make so many stipulations before a worker can receive benefits, that they are of no value whatsoever to the unemployed workers. The Wagner-Lewis Bill in particular, as the pamphlet points out, is the rallying point for all elements, from the most extremely reactionary, to the social-demagogues, who oppose the Workers' Unemployment Insurance Bill. And this pet measure of the Roosevelt "New Deal" not only excludes scores of categories of workers, like teachers, agricultural, railroad and marine workers, government workers, etc., but specifies that workers must have worked a certain length of time for a particular employer before becoming eligible to benefits under the Bill, then, if by some miracle, anyone is still left who is eligible for unemployment insurance benefits ". . . gets benefits . . . which shall equal or exceed $7 a week"—and at that, only for ten full weeks in any one year! Beside which, no payments are to be made until 12 months after contributions to the fund have begun. And the "contributions"? They are to be made by the employers through an excise tax—a tax which would be passed on to the workers and consumers in the shape of higher prices (and they are becoming high enough under the New Deal).

The Workers' Unemployment Insurance Bill has been endorsed by over 2,500 locals of the A. F. of L.; by several State Federations of Labor, and by five International Unions of the A. F. of L.—including the steel and textile unions. In the State Federations and International Unions the Workers' Bill defeated the Wagner-Lewis Bill.

The *Constitution and Regulations of the National Unemployment Council* is a pamphlet that must get the widest circulation. In it the unemployed worker, and the part-time and employed workers as well, can see that here is an organization built on the primary premise that only by the waging of constant struggles can the unemployed win increased relief and real unemployment insurance. The workers here learn of an organization open to any honest worker, regardless of political, racial or other differences; who agrees with the fighting aims of the organization—the winning of adequate relief and real unemployment insurance through struggle. It is an organization which does not go hat in hand to capitalist governmental officials, but, in the name of the workers who have produced the wealth of the nation, demands ample unemployment relief and insurance for them. Here the worker sees too, an organization of the unemployed based entirely on control by the rank and file.

It is necesary now to make some additions to the section on the united front, stressing more than is now done the desire of a united front of the Unemployment Councils with all other unemployed organizations, whether they are affiliated to national bodies or not; and also the fact that the Unemployment Council stands for unification of all organizations of the unemployed, and the reason why.

Don't Take It Lying Down is an excellent compilation of telling facts, which shows the point to which the standards of the unemployed workers have been driven down. The Pen and Hammer Club brings hard-hitting facts to show what is being done to the destitute families of the unemployed throughout the U.S.A.—$1 relief per family per week in Tulsa is a good example—with amounts averaging around $3 per week in other cities. And, as the survey shows, even such relief is gradually being cut to the bone or being cut out altogether. Not that one must imagine that any relief at all is given in every locality. Far from it. In the State of Louisiana not a penny of relief has yet been appropriated for the unemployed. Recently in New York

City, with its over a million unemployed, relief was cut off completely, because of "lack of funds", although the city is paying the banks $500,000 daily on interest for loans. The pamphlet also shows the ravages of the hunger diseases and the break-up of the home, and of the family, social and cultural degeneration. And the inevitable question of the worker—what can be done about it, is answered with the program of the Unemployment Councils—militant struggle for adequate relief and for real unemployment insurance at the expense of the bosses and government.

The Jobless Negro tells of the lot of the hardest-hit section of the unemployed—the Negro—by taking the concrete story of one Negro worker and his wife, and what happened to them when unemployment struck. Norman Smith's story is typical of the most oppressed section of the working class of the U.S.A., discriminated against in relief, quickly cut off from the relief rolls as Mrs. Smith was, and often allowed to die like dogs. The Unemployment Council was quick to take up the fight for the Smiths, and did not allow the legalized murder of Mrs. Smith, due to the starvation and miserable hospital treatment during pregnancy, to go by unnoticed. "She was not only a worker, but a Negro worker, and therefore she suffered starvation earlier and more deeply than even the white workers", as one Unemployment Council leader said at her funeral. "We must organize ourselves, black and white together". *The Jobless Negro* tells also of the leading part the Negro workers have played in the most militant struggles of the unemployed in the years since 1929.

The Negroes, having been the greatest sufferers among the unemployed, as they are the most oppressed of the toiling masses as a whole, have been in the forefront of the unemployed struggles. In New York and Cleveland, Negro unemployed workers have been murdered by the police because they were in the forefront of the unemployed demonstrations. Angelo Herndon, young Negro working class leader, has been sentenced to 20 years of living death in Atlanta because of his leadership of the unemployed, white and Negro. In Birmingham, Chattanooga, New Orleans and other large cities of the South, white and Negro workers have held large demonstrations before the City Halls of these towns.

Our Children Cry for Bread deals with another damning phase of capitalist exploitation, but it could be even more damning if it were less general and gave more facts—not just statistics, but illustrative facts, typical examples of the suffering of the working class children under capitalism and especially since the beginning of the economic crisis in the U.S.A. Too small a section is devoted to the demands for the children of the unemployed and to the struggles which have been waged around those demands (although unfortunately not too great a struggle has been waged for the working class children).

Make the Democrats Keep Their Promises is the pithy and sharp statement presented to President Roosevelt by a delegation of the Unemployment Councils on March 6, 1933, immediately after his inauguration. Roosevelt is reminded of the "forgotten man" to whom he made so many promises and on whom he based his campaign for election. Roosevelt is given concrete facts as to the actual status of the unemployed, both those getting a miserable pittance of relief and those getting none; of the part-time workers; of the most exploited Negro workers; the fake relief and insurance plans are analyzed and shown as hollow mockeries of the unemployed; the Unemployment Council delegation demands the immediate appropriation of $50 cash emergency relief for every unemployed and part-time worker, plus $10 for each dependent, and the enactment of the Workers' Unemployment Insurance Bill. The events since that time, under the "New Deal", are well-known—economy bills at the expense of the government workers and veterans; the forced labor camps; the rise in prices and in the inflation measures; the building of warships under the guise of "public works"; the N.I.R.A. and its driving down of working conditions and real wages.

Industrial Slavery analyzes the National Industrial Recovery Act (N.I.R.A.) especially as it affects the unemployed, and exposes the promises of Roosevelt to put many millions back to work under N.I.R.A. The N.I.R.A. promise of 5,000,000 back to work by October 1, 1933—it would be laughable if it were not so tragic. Even this small promise was nowhere near fulfilled. The Public Works Act is shown to provide solely for the building of 32 war-vessels and 290 bombing planes at the expense of $247,000,000—while relief is cut off in many cities or cut to the bone in the rest—the New Deal in a nutshell.

Again it must be stated that the value of these pamphlets is of the greatest for the unemployed workers and for use in their struggles for adequate relief and unemployment insurance—but also badly needed are pamphlets analyzing the work of the Unemployment Councils, and the struggles of the unemployed; and pamphlets dealing with the unity of the unemployed and the employed; the trade unions and the unemployed; the need for unity of the unemployed organizations, and a handbook on how the struggles of the unemployed should be waged.